

Charles H. Dyer





BOOK NO.

ACCESSION

B EL44J² A

638328



SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY




3 1223 00350 4298

CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME II



CHARLES W. ELIOT

Professor of Rhetoric University of Chicago

1873-1901

By

HENRY JAMES

Virtual Text

Manuscript

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

Digitized by the Internet Archive

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

100 NASSAU ST. N.Y.C.

1901

CHARLES W. ELIOT

President of Harvard University

1869-1909

By

HENRY JAMES

VOLUME TWO

Illustrated



Boston and New York

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

The Riverside Press Cambridge

1930

COPYRIGHT, 1930, BY HENRY JAMES

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO REPRODUCE
THIS BOOK OR PARTS THEREOF IN ANY FORM

B
E L 44 j 2 A

638328

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE · MASSACHUSETTS
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

3 1223 00350 4298

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XI	3
The years between 1876 and 1890, continued — Building up the Graduate Department — The value of Johns Hopkins's example — Gilman and Eliot	
CHAPTER XII: 1880-1894	29
A sheaf of letters	
CHAPTER XIII: 1890-1900	61
The state of the University in the early nineties contrasted with its condition in 1869 — Athletics — The three-year question — The ripening of the harvest — Eliot's growth — His new relation to his colleagues — Celebration of his twenty-fifth anniversary — Death of his son Charles — His adoption by the general public — His ideas — Inscriptions — The effect of his presence	
CHAPTER XIV: 1897-1909	112
Letters written between 1897 and 1909 on various subjects — The three-year degree question again — Visit of Prince Henry — The report of the Committee on Instruction in the College — Capital and Labor and the Faneuil Hall meeting — The Negro question in the South — Resignation from the presidency	
CHAPTER XV: 1909-1914	174
President Emeritus — Relations with neighbors and grandchildren — Relation to Harvard after retirement — Eliot's connections with philanthropic foundations and reform associations — Counsellor to the public — The Five-Foot Book-Shelf — "The Religion of the Future" — Journey to the Orient for the Peace Foundation — More letters on a variety of topics	
CHAPTER XVI: 1914-1920	247
A bundle of letters, mostly to Lord Bryce, written during the World War	

CHAPTER XVII: 1918-1926	287
Last years and letters — The ninetieth-birthday celebration — Mrs. Eliot's Death — Dr. Walcott's account of a visit — The end	
APPENDIX A.	335
Curriculum in Harvard College according to the Catalogue for 1868-69	
APPENDIX B.	343
Analysis of eight college faculties, 1868 to 1870	
APPENDIX C.	344
Graduate Schools of Harvard and Johns Hopkins compared	
APPENDIX D.	346
Tabular analyses of Harvard's growth during Eliot's administration	
APPENDIX E.	351
Certain inscriptions composed by Eliot	
APPENDIX F.	357
The Five-Foot Book-Shelf	
APPENDIX G.	359
Honors conferred upon Eliot	
APPENDIX H.	360
Portraits of Eliot	
APPENDIX I.	361
List of sources and authorities	
APPENDIX J.	364
Bibliography of Eliot's principal writings	
INDEX	379

ILLUSTRATIONS

CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT	<i>Photogravure frontispiece</i>
From the bust by Louis Potter in the Faculty Room, University Hall, Harvard College	
GRACE HOPKINSON ELIOT	32
A HORSEMAN ON MULEBACK: PRESIDENT ELIOT IN CALI- FORNIA	68
CHARLES F. DUNBAR	122
THEODORE LYMAN	122
THE CAMBRIDGE HOUSE, 1910-1926	174
THE NORTHEAST HARBOR HOUSE	174
CHARLES W. ELIOT AND HIS GRANDSON CHARLES W. ELIOT, 2D	206
THE PRESIDENT EMERITUS ACKNOWLEDGES A COLLEGE CHEER ON HIS NINETIETH BIRTHDAY	308
THE SUNSHINE AT ANCHOR	330

CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT

CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT



CHAPTER XI

The years between 1876 and 1890, continued — Building up the Graduate Department — The value of Johns Hopkins's example — Gilman and Eliot

A UNIVERSITY cannot be said to be complete, no matter how numerous its professional schools, nor how excellent its college, unless it provides opportunities for men to pursue liberal studies to the frontiers of knowledge, and unless it can give training in the methods of advanced work to young men who have been through the elements. The period of this chapter, 1876 to 1890, was approximately what may be called with historical correctness the period of the adolescence of the American universities. Before 1876 there had been efforts and immature beginnings only. During the fifteen years after Johns Hopkins opened her doors, she and the Harvard Graduate Department grew to something approaching adult stature, and became able to furnish to considerable numbers of young Americans such training and opportunities as they had previously found only in Europe. By 1890 other institutions were more or less successfully doing the same thing.

During this period "the university idea" became an expression familiar to Americans. Too vague and used with too many different shades of meaning to be susceptible of complete definition, it carried three essential connotations. First, it implied a largely diversified bill of intel-

lectual fare; second, it suggested advanced or graduate study in those subjects which are fundamental to all cultural learning, scholarship, and professional technique, and which are sometimes called the arts and sciences; third, it connoted what, about the same time, began to be popularly spoken of as "research." By different methods and with differing emphasis a number of institutions embraced the university idea. Cornell, Columbia, Leland Stanford, Michigan, California, Harvard, Johns Hopkins were conspicuous among those which attempted to give it body and life. The land-grant colleges and the technical schools, many of which were growing rapidly, to some degree manifested the same intention. The new agricultural colleges began to give proofs that research is stimulating to a teaching institution, and thus, unexpectedly, they helped to win consideration for the university idea. Among the ancient foundations Yale granted her undergraduates some choice of studies in 1876, and cautiously enlarged their privileges from then on. In 1886 she recognized the Sheffield Scientific School as a Department of the University coördinate with the College "proper." By 1890 Columbia found it expedient to form a representative University Council to unify her numerous new departments and schools. There was much to-do about "university reform" in England also. The whole tendency corresponded to something which the increasing complexity of Western civilization urgently required.

The most brilliant single experiment was the one made at Johns Hopkins. It influenced all the others, and al-

though it was conducted on a principle that would have been impossible of application in Cambridge, it was watched there with the keenest interest by the President and the Faculties. To ignore its influence would be to give an entirely wrong impression and to overlook the handsome acknowledgment which Eliot himself made at the twenty-fifth anniversary of Gilman's inauguration. "President Gilman," he then said, "your first achievement here, with the help of your colleagues, your students, and your trustees, has been, to my thinking — and I have had good means of observation — the creation of a school of graduate studies, which not only has been in itself a strong and potent school, but which has lifted every other university in the country in its departments of arts and sciences. I want to testify that the graduate school of Harvard University, started feebly in 1870 and 1871, did not thrive until the example of Johns Hopkins forced our Faculty to put their strength into the development of our instruction for graduates." ¹ There were doubtless obligations on both sides, for the two men trusted and respected one another and they had innumerable opportunities to talk with each other. Between 1885 and 1907 Gilman spent most of his summers at Northeast Harbor, so near to Eliot's house that they saw each other almost daily. But this is anticipating.

In advance of Gilman's installation — returning now to 1874 — Eliot conferred with the trustees in Baltimore for seven hours and expressed his views about post-gradu-

¹ Fabian Franklin, *Life of Daniel Coit Gilman*, 389.

ate work as well as about nearly every other problem in higher education; and he then went on record as believing that what was soon to be done in Baltimore could not be attempted successfully. To a question that was intended to elicit his views about advanced instruction, he replied,¹ "That is about the most important matter in education in the United States"; and continued, "I believe myself that it is the interest of the country to breed men thoroughly instructed in something — that our institutions, as a class, as a rule, confine themselves too much to producing an average man — a low average quality of attainment — and that we want to work out of that and give more attention to the special capacities and powers of individual men, and carry those individual men to higher levels." This went no farther than his dictum in the Inaugural that "For the individual, concentration and the highest development of his own faculty is the only prudence. But for the state, it is variety, not uniformity of intellectual production which is needful." He added a word of warning: "A university is not built in the air, so to speak. It is a growth, and I should doubt very much whether any institution, old or young, could cut loose from the educational foundations of the community in which it is placed — taking that word community in a large sense. We are as well off at Harvard as at any place in the country for carrying on education of a high order; but we could not deliberately undertake

¹ His remarks seem to have been taken down by a clerk, written out, and corrected by himself.

to give only a high degree of education for a few. We could not deliberately undertake that, not even if we were starting anew.”

Daniel C. Gilman, who, on the recommendation of Eliot and others, was shortly selected for the Presidency, took an opposite view of the practical possibilities. He and the Hopkins Trustees concluded that there was no need of another college of the ordinary kind, but that there was a place for “scientific laboratories and professorships, the directors of which should be free to pursue their own researches, while at the same time stimulating their students to prosecute study with a truly scientific spirit and aim.” From the outset they turned away from the traditional class system and organized their institution so as to advance the work of whoever displayed a special talent. Having but a relatively small collegiate department,¹ “cutting loose from the educational foundations of the community in which they were placed,” they did not have to use their money to support a corps of teachers who were largely occupied in imparting the elements, nor to drag along a mass of undergraduates who were more or less recalcitrant. They could attempt to assemble something like a society of intellectual athletes. Thus Johns Hopkins was a pot-started plant that had no initial root-attachments in anything near it and that depended for a number of years upon the skill of the gar-

¹ I am aware that Johns Hopkins did have a collegiate department from the beginning. But it could not, at the outset, feed the graduate department, and the latter was the prime object of solicitude to Gilman and the Johns Hopkins authorities.

dener who fed and tended it. So the gardener was of the utmost importance, and it has long since been recognized that Gilman proved to have a special aptitude for his task. He began by securing as the nucleus of what the Germans would have called a "philosophical faculty" a small but brilliant group of men; and then, armed with twenty fellowships, each of which might be held by its incumbent for one to three years, he went out and collected a score of students — "fellows" who were mature enough to profit by the opportunities that awaited them and competent to do them credit. It has been said that he would have been willing to travel across the continent to make sure of a man of original talent for one of his fellowships. A *flair* for quality in men was one of his gifts — or else he was very fortunate in the beginning. Another was a knowledge that research is largely conditional upon a state of mind and, allied to that knowledge, a sympathetic understanding of what investigators require if they are to produce and to guide their pupils in the methods by which original work is done. Around his group of teachers and fellows, other eager spirits gathered, and Gilman, tactful and clever in the work of promotion, somehow caused Johns Hopkins to thrill with the exhilaration of a fine adventure. Josiah Royce, one of the first band of fellows, said: "Here at last, so we felt, the American University had been founded.... The beginning... was a dawn wherein 'twas bliss to be alive. Freedom and wise counsel one enjoyed together.... One longed to be a doer of the word, and not a hearer only,

a creator of his own infinitesimal fraction of a product.”¹

Eliot had recognized from the beginning of his Presidency that opportunities for advanced work — which would, in the main, be post-graduate work — must somehow be provided. When money was made available for the support of six traveling fellowships, he announced that their object would be “to produce a class of highly educated scholars and learned men, not to help young men on their way to a profession” and that ordinary professional studies were not to be prosecuted by the traveling fellows.² A reading of his Annual Reports *seriatim* from 1872 to 1890 yields the impression that his belief in the importance of adding provisions for advanced work to the college curriculum was becoming an ever stronger conviction. Thus, in reporting for 1876–77, the year Johns Hopkins opened, he said: “The Corporation,... while fully aware of the costliness of advanced instruction, which must be given by the best teachers, and yet is in the nature of things addressed to few students, are disposed to do every thing in their power, with the means at their command, to increase the privileges and facilities offered by the University to advanced students.... During the current year, the attention of the College Faculty will be especially given to strengthening and systematizing the instruction for graduates. For a few years to come, it is to the improvement of this department of the University that the attention of the governing boards

¹ *Scribner's Mag.*, x (1891), 376, 383.

² *Ann. Rep.*, 1873–74, 21.

may be most profitably directed.”¹ And three years later he said that the Corporation had become convinced “That the prestige of the University was to be maintained and its influence increased, quite as much by amplifying the highest instruction, which is necessarily given to a few, as by improving the lower, which is sought by many. Indeed, they believed that there was no way of strengthening the institution as a whole so sure as that of strengthening and developing it in its highest departments of instruction.”²

In 1878, when a vacancy occurred in the Corporation, it was filled by the election of the first investigator of the modern type and, indeed, the first true man of science who had ever become a member of that little board of trustees. Alexander Agassiz was a man of many interests and great abilities, but his counsel concerning scientific matters and research in particular was valuable to Eliot. The President's Reports during the ensuing years contained numerous passages which indicated a desire to draw attention to what was being done in the Chemical and Physical Laboratories, the Museum, the Gray Herbarium, and to have the University family and the public understand that Harvard was supporting research as cordially as its resources would permit. In 1884, when looking forward to the impending celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Harvard, and speaking of what an anniversary fund might well be applied to, he wrote: “The course of events proves

¹ *Ann. Rep.*, 1876-77, 20-21.

² *Ann. Rep.*, 1879-80, 23.

that there is to be a university of the first class at Cambridge. . . . There is but one point at which success is not, humanly speaking, assured, and to this point the attention of the friends of the University should be directed. It is not yet clear that advanced instruction is to be sufficiently endowed.”¹

The processes by which graduate instruction was to be provided at Harvard were, however, not to be elaborated without travail. Eliot's initial experiment with the so-called University Lectures had proved, as we have seen, to be a false start. From this failure he had turned to the policy of providing gradually for more work of advanced grade by broadening the field of College studies and by making it easier for a student to specialize and so get farther along in some desired direction. He had induced the University to try to give meaning, and consequently value, to the degrees of Master of Arts, Doctor of Philosophy, and Doctor of Science. These measures looked to the expansion of the intellectual resources of the College and Scientific School regardless of departmental distinctions, and to something that should grow naturally out of the deepening soil of their resources. They tended to the superimposition of a Graduate School upon the College.

Lately a number of persons, notably Dr. Abraham Flexner and Dr. Henry S. Pritchett, have deplored some of the consequences of the overlapping of College and Graduate School and of the confusion of two distinct

¹ *Ann. Rep.*, 1883-84, 46-47.

functions which has resulted from this superimposition. These are criticisms of what has resulted from forty years of growth, and this is not the place for a discussion of them. The matter of present concern is to observe the natural beginnings from which much that is good, along, perhaps, with something that is not wholly good, has been engendered.

In fostering the growth of a Graduate Department there were at least three difficulties to overcome. First, money was required, and as Harvard's funds were already committed to the support of undertakings for which they barely sufficed, expansion had to wait for new revenues. In the next place, men qualified to do what was desired were few and hard to discover, and to secure them and make them reasonably contented was essential. Said Eliot, looking back late in life upon the first years of his Presidency: "The chief difficulty that I encountered was the procuring of teachers competent to give advanced instruction. There were really no guides to the discovery and invitation of the persons needed. Then none of the societies organized for the development and mutual support of learned and scientific men existed. By 1885 I could get some assistance... from the proceedings of the learned and scientific societies. At the beginning there was no such aid."¹ In 1873 (March 3) he wrote to Lyman: "... To illustrate the failure of the system of the last 40 years to breed scholars, let us take the most unpleasant fact which I know for those who have the future

¹ *Proceedings, Mass. Hist. Soc.*, Oct., 1923, 9-11.

of this University to care for — Asa Gray, Benjamin Peirce, Jeffries Wyman and Louis Agassiz are all going off the stage and their places cannot be filled with Harvard men, or any other Americans that I am acquainted with. This generation cannot match them. These men have not trained their successors. This is a very grievous fact which had better not be talked about — it is altogether too significant.”¹ When Gilman began to organize his staff at Johns Hopkins, this difficulty was in a measure increased for Eliot. Until that time — that is, since Eliot assumed the Presidency, raised salaries, and began to liberalize the curriculum — teaching positions at Harvard had enjoyed a power of attraction that was unique; but Johns Hopkins offered better remuneration and Gilman fished in all waters, casting his lures wherever he saw the man he wanted. This was legitimate, and Eliot wrote to him quite cordially (March 23, 1876): “Please don’t think that I feel in the least annoyed at proposals made by you to Harvard men. On the contrary, I should have thought it very odd if there had been no men here whom you cared to try for. Of course I am glad to be early informed of anything decided upon by your Board which may affect our administration; but I have no rights or dues in the premises.” As a complement to this, these sentences should be quoted from another letter (June 5,

¹ Johns Hopkins did not discover a zoölogist who could have stepped into Agassiz’s shoes, nor a botanist “to match Asa Gray,” nor a comparative anatomist quite like Jeffries Wyman; but it found no less a physicist than Henry A. Rowland, a biologist who was Newell Martin, and a chemist who was Ira Remsen. Meanwhile, according to Professor C. L. Jackson, Harvard was not giving Wolcott Gibbs an adequate opportunity to exercise his talents.

1876). They appear to have been written in reply to an invitation to nominate some Harvard men for Johns Hopkins Fellowships: "I have no request whatever to make with regards to your fellowships. . . . Your difficulty will be that certificates and recommendations are things which can be brought to no common standard. With some teachers and presidents all the geese are swans. I am well aware that one of my certificates seems like so much ice-water, after one of Dr. Peabody's or Prof. Peirce's glowing descriptions." It is known that Gilman angled for Wolcott Gibbs, William James, F. J. Child, George Martin Lane, and John Trowbridge at Harvard. In their cases he was unsuccessful. Whom, among the men he found elsewhere, Eliot would have liked to capture, is not known. In the end Gilman and Johns Hopkins raised up teachers for Harvard, but for a while it was their competition that was felt in Cambridge.

Its effects, it may be remarked in passing, were not all unhappy. When he first felt them, Eliot took occasion to remark in his Annual Report that the Corporation "are disposed to relieve professors of such routine work as can be equally well done by persons whose time is less valuable."¹ Perhaps the caution with which this soothing assurance was worded is what most impresses us now. But still, the declaration was made. Child declined the Johns Hopkins invitation for domestic reasons, but went on to tell Gilman that it had helped him as well as pleased him because it had led to his being wholly relieved at last

¹ *Ann. Rep.*, 1876-77, 20.

from the burden of correcting undergraduate compositions. He had been Eliot's neighbor, colleague, and friend since the fifties and his house had been one of the few to which the President had enjoyed going during the sorrowful years of his widowhood. His state of mind about students' themes must have been as well known to Eliot as was the fact that he was a rare scholar. But until Gilman's invitation providentially brought both men to a just apprehension of the situation, Child had been compelled to let his Chaucerian studies and his researches in ballad literature suffer the interference of what he chafed against as a loathsome chore.

Another difficulty was that Eliot was relatively deficient in certain qualities which, in Gilman, contributed to Johns Hopkins's success. The work of the Graduate Department was to be almost as diversified as the interests of the human mind. To induce in the teachers a sanguine consciousness of departmental vigor was more difficult at Harvard, where they were all compelled to devote a large portion of their energies to undergraduate instruction and College business, than it was at Johns Hopkins; and in either place it was a task to tax the skill of the chief executive to the utmost. In subtle ways the atmosphere of a college community is influenced, like that of any other human group, by the qualities of the man at the head of it. Somebody once described Cambridge rather cruelly as a place which an unusual number of interesting people somehow turned into a social desert. Eliot could remark, in the midst of judicious observations about the good ex-

ample that college teachers set the community, that "the common amusements of society have no charm for scholars. No man can be a successful student who does not devote his evenings to work; and the ordinary university teacher counts an evening given to the theatre or to social amusement, as an evening lost or wasted."¹ That gives one the sense of something that he lacked, and was felt to lack. Although he was a man of intellectual power and although his colleagues frequently sought his counsel about questions of official conduct, they did not bring him, not even the chemists did, the news of their scholarly work, either to consult his wisdom and obtain his encouragement when they were in difficulties or to share with him the first tidings of their achievements. Furthermore, his genius was not, correctly speaking, scholarly, although, as an organizer and administrator, he was guided by a conviction of the high importance of learning. He knew that members of the Harvard Faculties were by way of producing works great and small, and he stored up mental notes about who was productive and who was not, whose *opus* was well spoken of, whose was not. But he could not read them, and — what is more to the point in this connection — did not pretend to. If a member of the Johns Hopkins Faculty got out a book and met Gilman within the week, Gilman always had something cordial to say to him. He might have glanced at the preface; probably he never did go beyond the table of con-

¹ "The Aims of the Higher Education" (1891). In *Educational Reform*, 223, 247; and Neilson, I, 71, 94.

tents; but he would have gleaned at least the slight impression that sufficed for the kindly social act. In Cambridge, by contrast, when a young professor summoned up his courage and asked, "Have you looked at the copy of my new book that I sent you, Mr. Eliot?" the response was simply, "Ginn?" — with a rising inflection. The President was correct. Ginn and Company were the publishers of the book.

Eliot and Gilman both knew that learning and discovery thrive together, not only because the fruit of one man's quest enlarges the knowledge of others, but because something of the temper of the adventurer is necessary to preserve the scholar from pedantry. But there was a shade of difference. Eliot's zeal was for the promotion of human welfare. Knowledge for the sake of knowledge or art for art's sake made him impatient; knowledge applicable to life excited his enthusiasm. When he considered what researches should be encouraged at Harvard, his thought turned to the investigations that might produce useful results — if helpful socially, as by improving sanitation, rather than in a merely commercial way, so much the better: if they might be applied promptly and widely, best of all. Gilman, however, appeared to be inspired by the belief that when a university proposes to itself to advance knowledge as well as to teach, it is better for it to lay aside the question, What use can be made of the result of this investigation? In the experimental laboratory of a manufacturing corporation or a technical school the inquiry may be appropriate; but seldom in an institution

which desires to promote the advancement of knowledge. Where knowledge is to be pursued for the sake of human welfare, it must incidentally be pursued, by some men, for its own sake. And where that is understood, the exploration of the frontiers of knowledge becomes a holy cause, and people are likely to feel the way Royce said he did at Baltimore. Gilman was the first American university president to act boldly on this theory and also the first to have an opportunity to practice it with the aid of large resources. Though Eliot came in time to see the matter much as Gilman did, he had to learn by observation and experience. When he delivered his Inaugural Address, this function of a university was the only one to which his allusion was noticeably restrictive. "Experience teaches," he said, "that the strongest and most devoted professors will contribute something to the patrimony of knowledge; or if they invent little themselves, they will do something toward defending, interpreting, or diffusing the contribution of others. Nevertheless," he had then added, "the prime business of American professors in this generation must be regular and assiduous class teaching. With the exception of the endowments of the Observatory, the University does not hold a single fund primarily intended to secure to men of learning the leisure and means to prosecute original researches." To pronounce thus was to speak correctly as a trustee of limited funds, and also to recognize the true function of a college. But it was chilling. And it left out something essential to a graduate school. In 1869, no graduate department yet

existed. In 1888, however, one was struggling into its maturity, and Eliot still reiterated that the University authorities "must use the resources which the community places in their hands, primarily, to provide the instruction and guidance, and the aids to instruction which are demanded by the hundreds of students who throng the college halls, and only secondarily to promote research and the advancement of learning."¹ "Research" — says Dr. Abraham Flexner — "was not recognized in America as one of the dominant concerns of higher education until the flag was nailed to the mast on the opening of Johns Hopkins University!"²

It does not diminish the significance of Eliot's views about teaching and research to say that it was merely a question of emphasis. How conscientiously Harvard's President applied his theory of his trusteeship has been illustrated by Child's case. Again, Professor C. L. Jackson relates that when he was a young teacher of Chemistry in the seventies he asked Eliot if he might be relieved of the duty of teaching one class in order to prosecute certain investigations. The President, in his stately manner, propounded a question to which an answer can seldom be given — "What will be the result of these investigations?" They would be published, was the reply. The President wanted to know where. Mr. Jackson named a German chemical journal. "I can't see that that will serve any useful purpose here," said Eliot, and therewith dismissed the matter. An almost identical

¹ *Ann. Rep.*, 1887-88, 22.

² *Atlantic Monthly* (1925), CXXXVI, 530, 532.

story is told about the rejection of a request by Professor F. W. Putnam for money to pay for an investigation, but it carries a sequel which goes on to relate that two years later, after Johns Hopkins had announced its purpose to emphasize research, Putnam brought his request forward again and it was granted. Even though it may be assumed that there were financial reasons behind the refusals — Eliot had ten jobs waiting for every dollar — there seems no reason to challenge the impression that his initial ideas about what must be done for investigators had to be expanded. Professor Jackson remarks that, although Eliot never did properly understand research, he showed his usual open-mindedness and readiness to learn by trying to further it more generously after Johns Hopkins had convinced him of the necessity. He had never been a research worker himself. His brief and almost casual tarrying in Kolbe's laboratory while he learned German in Marburg was not to be compared to the immersion a candidate for a doctorate would have submitted himself to. He had been a teacher, but always a teacher of elementary students. What he understood and what fascinated him were methods of teaching and problems of organization. One of his first reasons for wanting to provide for graduate students was that they would be interesting to the instructors and so help bring about an improvement in the quality of their teaching. Said Eliot to Professor G. H. Palmer when, in the early days, Palmer was thinking of leaving Harvard for a college which did not aspire to teach graduates: "As long as the

main duty of the faculty is to teach boys, professors need never pursue their subjects beyond a certain point. With graduate students to teach, they will regard their subjects as infinite, and will keep up that constant investigation which is necessary for the best teaching.”¹ In saying this, he had the teaching of undergraduates in mind as much as the instruction of graduates.

To gloss over Eliot’s difficulties, by whatever explainable, would be to overlook the fret and perplexity that more or less pervaded the time, and to ignore the criticism and resistance that had to be met at every step. A letter has fortunately been preserved which gives a sense of the anxieties of the moment in a way that nothing but a contemporary document can. It also recalls to remembrance how frequently it was Eliot’s wont to seek advice and how magnanimously he bore with criticism. Its author was promoted to a full professorship the next year. When he wrote it, on May 17, 1881, he was a young instructor.

DEAR SIR: May I be allowed, in answer to your request of last evening that each member of the Faculty would contribute toward a solution of the problem of making our College an intellectual power in the country, to bring forward some points which do not seem appropriate to a Faculty meeting?

As to the fact of a startling difference in the spirit of

¹ Statement of Prof. G. H. Palmer. Also quoted by C. F. Haskins in Morison, *Development of Harvard University*, 461-62.

work at Baltimore and here I think no one can be in doubt who has made himself acquainted with the working of the newer college.... There every young man is made to feel himself a part of a living and active organism. If he shows any sign of original power, he is immediately offered every motive to develop it. What seems of more importance he is given every opportunity *of showing such signs* to those persons who are to decide upon his future course. I have known intimately a considerable number of men who have been connected with the J.H.U. and their testimony is unanimous as to the quick and generous sympathy extended to every scholarly effort. Every man is known and judged, not by chance rumors but by actual acquaintance with him and by the application of actual tests to him. Nor is this inspiration of sympathy confined to the men of higher places. I believe that the youngest student of the J.H.U. feels himself to be judged by actual standards of value, and is therefore led to shape his work by such standards.

I fear almost to offend if I call attention plainly to the difference here, but I stand so much nearer to the class of men most directly here concerned than you can possibly come that it seems to me a duty. I have watched for five years as carefully as a man whose whole hopes in life depended upon it could watch, for any signs of this active sympathy with scholarly endeavor and I cannot now do otherwise than say I have been disappointed.... I think there is scarcely a young instructor here who is not ready to break his connections at any moment when an op-

portunity elsewhere opens and their readiness to do this is almost in proportion to their actual scholarly power. In every case I think these are men keenly alive to the material advantages of a residence in Cambridge and who would sacrifice pecuniary profit to the prospect of recognition for the best work they are capable of. They simply feel that any attempt at gaining such recognition is hopeless. I may be wrong in thinking it unfortunate that a young man coming here with fresh enthusiasm, after years of training, should be allowed to open extra courses of instruction without ever a word of inquiry, not to say of interest on the part of his superiors and that his only relation to the governing body should be touching the routine of his position, and that he must stake his reputation on the chance reports of persons totally unqualified to judge of the best things in his intellectual life. It may be right that my department, which you spoke of to me as one of those in which a better relation than usual existed among the instructors, should have held but two meetings in five years and those simply for the most purely technical purposes, that neither of the professors should ever have been in my house, nor I, excepting formally in theirs; that the new Historical Society should have come into being in face of the opposition (or at least discouragement) of the only other instructor besides myself who was present at the preliminary meeting. All these may be trifles but I am impressed with the conviction that it is these things and the spirit they represent which stand in the way of the coming of that other spirit, whose absence

you, Sir, declared was now threatening the very life of our University. We have money, teachers, all the machinery, but the spirit of high scholarship which should animate the whole is not the thing to which our minds are unwaveringly turned....

The remedy suggested last evening by the report of the committee, that the studies of the whole College be made elective, does not, however wise in itself, seem to me to touch the root of the matter. I cannot believe that any change of form will have an effect which only a change of spirit can produce....

I think, Sir, you will not misunderstand the motive which prompts me in these suggestions. If it be answered that we are left perfectly free to our own method of teaching, I think every one would acknowledge that with gratitude. It is the extension of this freedom to the point of isolation and apparent indifference which seems to many persons an evil in our College which no formal changes can remove. With a single desire that the interest of true scholarship may prevail over all other considerations, I remain... etc.

The interest of this document will not be diminished if I add that its author is Professor Ephraim Emerton, and that when, recently, with his letter in my pocket, I told him that I wanted to talk with him about Eliot, he interrupted to warn me that the former President was one of his heroes and that he was probably incapable of speaking about him except in words of praise.

It would, palpably, be as great a mistake to accept such an expression as portraying the state of mind of everybody in Cambridge as to suppose that it depicted the chronic state of mind of its writer. Wolcott Gibbs did not accept Gilman's invitation to migrate to Baltimore in spite of the fact that he continued to resent the way in which he had been divorced from the work of the College's Chemical Department. Lane, Trowbridge, Child, and James could not be lured away. William James wrote to his wife, after visiting the Continental universities in 1882: "The total lesson of what I've done in the past month is to make me quieter with my home-lot and readier to believe that it is one of the chosen places of the Earth. Certainly the instruction and facilities at our university are on the whole superior to anything I have seen.... We only lack abdominal depth of temperament and the power to sit for an hour over a single pot of beer without being able to tell at the end of it what we've been thinking about.... The first thing to do is to establish in Cambridge a genuine German plebeian Kneipe club, to which all instructors and picked students shall be admitted. If that succeeds, we shall be perfect, especially if we talk therein with deeper voices...." ¹

Granting that the happiest accomplishment depends upon the state of mind of the workman as well as upon the organization of his surroundings and equipment, Eliot would have said that he could do his best for the state of mind by guaranteeing personal liberty and re-

¹ *Letters of William James*, I, 216.

fraining from interference. So to govern and administer was more natural for him than "to extend quick and generous sympathy to every scholarly effort" or to organize little ways of giving encouragement. He might have said, if he had condescended to argument, that, being what he was, it would, in the long run, be the best way for Harvard. In writing to an Englishman to whom he was offering a professorship in 1880, he gave the following explanation: "Within his own sphere [a Harvard professor] is master. He may adopt a pure lecture method, or require his students to translate, 'recite,' or answer questions. He may be strict or lax as to discipline in his lecture-room. He may cultivate social relations with his pupils, or never speak to them except in the lecture-room. Since there will generally be found among his students a considerable variety of opinions and conditions — religious, political, and social — he will naturally give to others the same freedom which he enjoys himself. He may present his own views with all the force he possesses, but he cannot authoritatively impose his personal opinions upon his students." As a charter of academic liberties this left nothing unassured.

Counting on teachers and students to bring to pass in time what he dared not attempt to do at a stroke, Eliot fostered a growth that showed more and more vitality. There were many men about him who were every bit as eager as he to have an excellent Graduate Department at Harvard. J. M. Peirce, the devoted Secretary of the Academic Council, was conspicuous among them. In-

numerable discussions occurred in Faculty meetings and Council meetings, and Eliot presided over them all, sometimes interjecting a statement or summing up a debate, but usually listening — tolerant, patient, heedful. So, while Johns Hopkins began as a pot-plant tended by Gilman's skill, the Harvard Graduate Department came up like a patch of vegetation on open ground. Eliot, the bigger man with less delicate fingers, did not often touch its foliage; but with his spade, the elective system, he kept loosening and deepening the soil. He had no doubt that this labor was well applied.

The general theory upon which Harvard's Graduate Department, thus encouraged, evolved itself was marked first by the idea that there could be no arbitrary distinction between graduate and undergraduate studies. (Where courses "especially" or "primarily" for graduates were listed in the Catalogue, it was explained that qualified undergraduates might elect them; and, on the other hand, that all undergraduate electives were open to graduate students.) Second, by the idea that if the College was to be a thoroughgoing democracy of learning, embracing scientific as well as humanistic studies, it would supply a broad enough foundation for advanced studies of the widest scope; this being so, that, third, the same man might be expected to teach both undergraduates and graduates; and, finally, that there would be no occasion for any special Philosophical Faculty such as Yale had tried prematurely to call into being alongside the College in the first half of the century and such as

Johns Hopkins organized without any true college at all. The elective system, it cannot be repeated too often, was a means as well as an end. As President Hyde said, "It was the surplus intellectual resources accumulated under [that system] that made it possible for Harvard to perform the arduous and delicate task of rearing a great graduate school on the broad foundations of undergraduate work."¹

¹ *Atlantic Monthly* (June, 1899), 354. Cf. *Ann. Rep.*, 1884-85, 31-34; also Eliot in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.* (Oct., 1923), 10. Citations to other references in support of the statement that the elective system was a necessary means to the building-up of the University in Eliot's view could be multiplied indefinitely.

CHAPTER XII

1880-1894

A sheaf of letters.

THE reader who has been through three chapters of almost continuous discussion of educational policies and problems, deserves an interlude. In this chapter he shall find a sheaf of extracts, gleaned from the letter files, some of them illustrating what has been said in preceding pages, others possessing a more personal interest. The sequence in which they are presented will be more or less according to dates. The reader should be reminded that President Gilman, to whom the first one was addressed, had once been a member of the faculty of the Sheffield Scientific School at Yale.

To D. C. Gilman

Mar. 9, 1880

MY DEAR GILMAN, — Many thanks for your note of Sunday last. Words of praise from a man who, like you, knows what he is talking about, are always welcome. They are particularly welcome just now, because affairs here have been for a year past at a stage when much discussion, criticism and opposition were inevitable. Through it all we manage to hitch along. If there is a block in one Faculty I find a chance to get ahead in another. A fourth year's course in the Medical School, and

the reconstruction of the Divinity School are the things at hand at this moment. There is no doubt that good work done in one university helps all other growing universities. You help us therefore. I hope that the University of Pennsylvania will get a good lift on the occasion of choosing a new president. What a gain it would be if the spirit of the Sheffield S.S. was the spirit of Yale College. I have had some dealings with the Yale Faculty lately on the subject of admission requisitions; for I am chairman of a committee on that subject appointed by the Association of Colleges (ten in New England). The manners and customs of the Yale Faculty are those of a porcupine on the defensive. The other colleges were astonished at first, but now they just laugh. I am glad you are going to Smith; we ought to help these separate colleges for women as much as we can.

Mrs. Eliot and I are going to Europe — little bits of it — this summer vacation. Twelve weeks, voyages included, is too short a time, but all I can get. Our best regards to Mrs. Gilman. We have been glad to hear that her health has been stronger this year.

Very truly yours....

The two following extracts are taken from file copies which do not show to whom the letters were addressed. The date of the first was February 10, 1880, and of the second April 4, 1881. Each seems to have been an answer to enquiry of which the tenor can easily be inferred.

MY DEAR SIR, — ... The work of the president of a considerable university is chiefly administrative; it requires, all the time, industry, good temper, patience, and physical toughness, and, now and then, courage and resolution. All these are qualities which young men exhibit to perfection. Moreover it is a function in which experience and practice tell very much. I do not mean mere age or experience in other occupations, but experience in that occupation. Therefore the younger a man is put to this work the better; provided that he has fully demonstrated his quality. Some people think it hard to put a young man over old ones. There are two answers to this objection to electing a young man your Provost; in the first place, the teachers in a properly organized university are not “under” the president in any military, industrial or other objectionable sense; and secondly, old professors will always like an efficient young provost better than an inefficient old one. What Faculties want is diligent and discreet administration which commands confidence....

DEAR SIR, — Three causes may justify the Trustees of a College in peremptorily demanding the resignation of a professor, viz. bad character, neglect of duty, [in-] capacity, mental or physical. The professor thus dealt with is entitled to a clear statement of the cause; but it does not follow that the cause will be set forth in the official proceedings of the Trustees, as it would necessarily be if the professor were dismissed.

Such forced resignations have a very bad effect upon the institution, but sometimes Trustees are obliged between two evils to choose the least. An institution in which such resignations should be frequent would soon find it impossible to procure desirable professors.

The professor who, knowing the motives or reasons which led to the action of the Trustees, resigns under such circumstances, practically says, without necessarily admitting that the Trustees are right that he does not think it worth his while to discuss the subject. The professor who is asked to resign without knowing why, must in my judgment decline, if he would preserve either his self-respect or the respect of his friends.

You are at liberty to show this note in private, but not to publish it....

Two letters which come next require a word of explanation. On December 22, 1882, Colonel Henry Lee sent a Christmas letter and check for two thousand dollars to the President under cover of a note to Mrs. Eliot. Lee hoped "that the mode of transmission would in part atone for the unsentimental form we have resorted to for an expression of our good-will." The enclosure to the President said, — "A few of your friends have longed to express their sympathy with you, their appreciation of your high resolves, your austere self-denial." (It appears that the friends were H. P. Kidder, Henry Lee, A. T. Lyman, Theodore Lyman, R. T. Paine, Jr., and "an old gentleman who shuns publicity.")



GRACE HOPKINSON ELIOT

To Henry Lee

Dec. 24, 1882

DEAR COLONEL LEE, — Your note of yesterday, with its surprising enclosure, touched me very much. The words which will do more than any others in it to give me a cheerful Christmas are “My dear Charles” and “Your old friend, Henry Lee.” You know that I have often combatted — ineffectually I see — your ideas about my self-denial. Hard work, within the limits of strength, I have no objection to; on the contrary I like it, if fruition is given; anxiety, and disappointment I have suffered, but I do not perceive that wealth is any defence against them. The satisfactions and pleasures which I value most, I have; but there are many luxuries and superfluities which I should like to have — not being as much of an ascetic as you fancy — but do not have because I cannot afford them. Some of these things it will give me much pleasure to owe to your kindness and that of the friends who have joined you in this expression of goodwill. So when you hear of my going to California, or buying a horse, or getting a likeness of wife or son, or committing any similar agreeable extravagance, you will know that I am enjoying [the] Xmas present. I need not say that your mode of sending it to me was the pleasantest possible and that Mrs. Eliot joins her thanks with mine.

At this time the salary of the President was five thousand dollars. If that sum was inadequate or unworthy of the man and his position, Christmas presents were certainly

not the way to augment it regularly. But nobody cared to propose to Eliot to vote himself a larger salary out of the always inadequate revenues of the University. So the next year a subscription provided a special fund for the increase of the salary of whoever might be President.

To Alexander Agassiz

Sept. 11, 1884

DEAR AGASSIZ: —... It is now more than a year since I have had that extra \$3000. salary which you and Harry Lee promised for me and my successors. I have been surprised to find how much easier life has been made by that additional income. It enables me to do some pleasant things which I could not formerly have done at all, and to do many other things without care or circumspection which I accomplished perhaps before, but only with forethought and trouble.

That was a very friendly act, for which I am afraid that I did not sufficiently thank you. After experiencing the benefits, I can thank you more intelligently and heartily now. Very truly yrs....

In 1886, Ephraim W. Gurney died. He had been Eliot's friend and counsellor since the early teaching years; and had been his "candidate" for the presidency in 1869. As the first Dean of the College, Gurney had stood closer to Eliot than anybody else, and since 1884 he had been a fellow member of the Corporation.

To William C. Endicott

Sept. 17, 1886

...The loss of Gurney is indeed irreparable for me, as well as for the College. We have worked together with general agreement as to policy, method and aims for seventeen years. He was the best possible associate for me, being more patient, conciliatory and conservative than I, while desiring essentially the same changes in the structure and methods of the University. In the Faculty he was always a main reliance, being keen in argument, disinterested, and just, and at the same time having a strong sense of humor, invaluable in such a body. Very truly yours....

Eliot's two sons were now in college, choosing their studies and making up their minds what professions to pursue. Letters to them reflect little rays of light upon the father and illustrate the kind of counsel that he gave to others as well as to his own sons. They should be introduced by the sentences in which Eliot explained his eldest son's temperament when he compiled the book about him that bears the title "Charles Eliot." Speaking of Charles as he was at the age of seventeen or eighteen, he said, "Then his father and brother had very different temperaments from his. They were sanguine, confident, content with present action, and little given to contemplation of either the past or the future; Charles was reticent, self-distrustful, speculative, and dissatisfied with his actual work, though faithful and patient in studies

which did not interest him or open to him intellectual pleasures.”¹

And again, — “Between seventeen and twenty-one Charles suffered a good deal at times from that mental and moral struggle, that questioning of self and the world, which all thoughtful and reserved boys, who have a good deal in them, have to pass through. They become aware that they are thinking and responsible beings, and find themselves forced to consider questions of conscience, faith, and love, and the meaning of life and death. Sudden floods of emotion overwhelm them, and seasons of uncontrollable doubt, misgiving, and sadness distress them. The struggle is apt to be a lonely one. Nobody will or can answer their deeper questions. ‘I have trodden the wine-press alone.’”²

During the Christmas holiday of Charles’s senior year, when he had just turned twenty-three and was much perplexed about the choice of a profession, his father advised him thus: “I hope you will not feel in haste to get through with your education, your ‘infancy,’ or period of training. There is no reason why you should, and I want you to enjoy a sense of ease and calm in that matter. It would suit me excellent well if you should quietly study for an A.M. next year, or should spend a year in study and reading without aiming at a degree at all. If you would like to have two Senior years and take your A.B. in 1883, I should be entirely content. You need not feel

¹ *Charles Eliot*, 16. The passage refers to about the year 1876.

² *Ibid.*, 24.

that you ought to be earning your living, or doing something in the actual market-place. That will come soon enough. There are fields of knowledge and philosophy which you have hardly set foot in. Take time to view them with a disengaged mind. The sense of being driven or hurried is very disagreeable to you; then arrange your life so that you cannot be driven or hurried. Nothing in the way of college rank or college degree is of consequence enough to cause you the loss of enjoyment in study and of tranquillity of mind. I want you to have an intellectual delight in study for the study's sake. You have had a large mental growth during the past two years, but have not been as happy in it as I would like to have you. For the rest of your infancy — and do not shorten it — seek quiet and cultivate contentment.”¹

In the course of the ensuing summer Charles decided to become a landscape architect. There were as yet no schools which trained young men for that profession, and his preparation had to be by private study, travel and observation, and an apprenticeship in an office. In 1886 he was in Europe and, in writing home to his father, referred to himself as “incompetent in dealing with men.” To this his father replied:

April 20, '86

DEAR CHARLES, — Don't imagine yourself deficient in power of dealing with men. Such dealings as you have thus far had with boys and men you have conducted very

¹ *Charles Eliot*, 29-30. December, 1881.

suitably. There is no mystery about successful business intercourse with patrons and employés. Nobody can think, and at the same time pay attention to another person, as you seem to expect to do. On the contrary, exclusive attention to the person who is speaking to you is a very important point in business manners. Nothing is so flattering as that. Some audible or visible signs of close attention are of course desirable. Then there is very seldom any objection to the statement, "I should like to think that over."... I wish you were tough and strong like me. But you have nevertheless an available measure of strength, and within that measure an unusual capacity of enjoyment. In this respect you closely resemble your mother. She enjoyed more in her short life than most people in a long one; and particularly she delighted in natural scenery. You get a great deal more pleasure out of your present journeyings than I ever could have. I should not have your feelings of fatigue and weakness, but neither should I have your perception of the beautiful and your enjoyment of it. When you come to professional work, you will have to be moderate in it. Where other men work eight hours a day, you must be content with five. Take all things easily. Never tire yourself out. If you feel the blues coming upon you, get a book and a glass of wine, or go to bed and rest yourself. The morbid mental condition is of physical origin. Take comfort in the thought that you can have a life of moderate labor, — the best sort of life. You will have a little money of your own, and need not be in haste to earn

a large income. I am strong and can work twelve hours a day. Consequently I do; and if it were not for Mt. Desert, I should hardly have more time for reflection and real living than an operative in a cotton mill. For a reasonable mortal, life cannot truly be said to have "terrors," any more than death. [Charles had quoted the lines: 'I am not one whom death does much dismay. Life's terrors all death's terrors far outweigh.'] The love of beauty is a very good and durable correspondence between your soul and the world; but the love of purity, gentleness, and honor is a better one.¹

As Charles advanced successfully in his profession, he learned to trust his powers; but he seems, for a while at any rate, to have continued to be haunted by the riddle of man's relation to the universe in a manner in which his father never had been.

To his son Charles

June 7, 1887

... You are unreasonable in expecting to know the sense of your existence. Nobody knows the meaning of any existence — of flower, beast, man, nation, or world. Live each day as usefully, innocently and happily as you can, and leave the rest to God. It is time you were married. You are too solitary....

¹ *Charles Eliot*, 91-92.

To the Same

August 9, 1887

... In observing the character of a young person, girl or boy, study if you can the parents. A selfish and unprincipled mother and a dull and feeble father are not likely to have children of desirable attributes — *physical* or *moral*. If inheritances have been confirmed and developed by education under the influence of a bad mother, the chances are still less favorable. Secondly, observe the conduct of the young person towards those to whom he or she is bound by intimate ties of obligation or duty. A selfish daughter or sister is little likely to make a disinterested wife. A son who makes his confessions to young women whom he meets casually rather than to his mother may easily behave in like manner after marriage. The right way for a girl is to seek her advice and get her support and encouragement from the loving kindred who stand by her day after day and to whom countless tender ties should bind her. If no such ties are felt, it is a very bad sign. Intense enjoyment of the beauty of the world, and of all the rational pleasures of life, is perfectly consistent with the purest and most unselfish character in man or woman. Don't hang round the first divorced from the second. It is dangerous....

The foregoing extract, and the one that preceded it are from letters that were written from Europe. Mr. and Mrs. Eliot went abroad before the spring of eighty-seven, and remained eight months. First visiting Egypt and the

Nile, they later turned northward and spent the summer traveling, with many leisurely pauses, about Europe. Meanwhile the second son had graduated from Harvard College in 1884, had turned to theology and was now in the Unitarian ministry.

To his son Samuel

Aug. 10, 1887

DEAR SAM; — I hope this will salute you on your birthday — the 25th! You have had a reasonably happy childhood and youth; but the best part of life is all before you — the next 25 years. Experience, knowledge, and caution will increase, but powers not much. Opportunities will multiply, but your capacity to improve them will not much enlarge — only become prompter and more facile. A man at 25 is good for about all he ever will be, so far as quickness of apprehension and power of work are concerned. You ought still to gain much in steadiness, tenacity and judgment. Tenacity involves singleness of aim — or at least one main object at a time....

To the Same

Nov. 22, 1887

... When you come to defining Unitarian principles — positive ones — you will find the ground shaky. God is love, progress, and inspiration; man is capable of love, improvement, and eternal aspiration; Jesus was the best of ethical and religious teachers; Christians are people who pursue the Christian ideals as set forth in the Gospels.

Hold on to the old names — God, Heaven, Christian, and keep as much fellowship as possible with those who retain more of the old faiths than you do. So far as the Ethical brethren work for the same ends which you work for, be glad of their company; but don't let them define your religion for you....

To the Same

Sept. 3, 1887

... We paid our respects to the site of the house where John Robinson lived, marked by a tablet in English on the present house. His is as encouraging an example as I know of obscure and apparently unproductive fidelity to convictions, yielding in after generations incalculable fruit. Verily Freedom is a mistress worth serving — no matter in what branch of her service, in commerce, in education, in legislation or in religion. The most interesting monument in Germany is the Luther memorial at Worms, commemorating Luther, Savonarola, Wyckliffe, Huss and Peter Waldo. To “hitch your wagon to a star” practically means — connect your main work in life with a generous and progressive idea.... London is dark and dirty as ever, but full of all kinds of real value....

To the Same

Feb. 20, 1888

... Yesterday (Sunday) we attended M——'s church and heard an excellent sermon badly delivered. The

whole service lacked cheerfulness. The tones of M——'s voice and his inflections were all depressing! It is almost the worst of faults in a preacher. Faith, hope and love are all cheerful things and ought to be made to appear so by those who preach them. Life is not always bright, but religion should be....

The next letters were addressed to a Harvard graduate, a well-remembered member of the New York Bar who was never afraid to differ with those in authority or with the majority, but who, on this occasion, expressed views which a large number of college graduates more or less fully shared with him. In college circles of other than Harvard allegiance a large majority would, in fact, have agreed with the gist of his principal contention, — that “young men between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two, ... are very ignorant and immature;... they are unable to decide wisely as to a symmetrical, well-ordered course of study, which shall give a harmonious, well-rounded development to all their mental muscles. As to what should be such a course of study, we laymen do not pretend to say. As to that point, we are profoundly ignorant. Our sons are even more so. As to that, no one can decide intelligently, or wisely, except a body of able, learned, and experienced teachers.¹” This was exactly the notion which Eliot had dealt with in his Baltimore address and which he was continually having to meet in discussions in the Board of Overseers and elsewhere. “To ignorant or

¹ Albert Stickney, *Considerations on New Harvard Methods*, 5.

thoughtless people — said he in the Baltimore address — it seems that the wisdom and experience of the world ought to have produced by this time a uniform course of instruction, good for all boys, and made up of studies permanently pre-eminent; but there are two strong reasons for believing that this convenient result is unattainable: in the first place, the uniform boy is lacking.”¹

To Albert Stickney

Feb. 5, 1889

... Your idea that it is important in education to require of young men something disagreeable is a very common one; but I believe it to be founded on an underestimate of the inevitable hardships in this world. At Cambridge, for instance, every student chooses his studies; but when he has chosen Latin, or History, or Zoölogy, he finds that nine-tenths of all the work which he has to do in those chosen studies is hard, routine, uninteresting labor. If he would attain any joy-giving excellence in his chosen work he must force himself to disagreeable labor, and student life is full of disagreeable labor, just as real life is. No man can master anything without a deal of drudgery. The Freshman feels this, just as fully as the professional man of fifty. Indeed, so many and so urgent are the disagreeable labors of school life, college life, and money-earning life, in this world, that it seems to me absolutely superfluous to invent other disagreeableness, whether for children or for men. My own life is much

¹ “What is a Liberal Education?” Neilson, at 65.

more varied and interesting than that of most men, but I should say that nineteen-twentieths of it was drudgery; that is, it consists of uninteresting repetitions of familiar strenuous exertions. A Harvard student's life has just the same quality, in spite of the fact that he chooses the subjects of his study, and is left in some measure to his own sense of what is becoming and advantageous in regard to going to lectures. Do you think it is a wise parent who invents disagreeable tasks for his children, or enforces any observance simply because it is disagreeable? It seems to me, as the result of my observation, that such a parent is very unwise, and will certainly destroy his influence with his own children....

To the Same

April 1, 1891

... I fully appreciate your consideration in giving to your pamphlet only a private circulation; but I beg that you will not hesitate to publish it, if you yourself believe that it would thereby be more useful. I believe absolutely in public criticism and discussion. I have been ready to take my part in them for the last twenty-two years; and I still am....

To the Same

April 11, 1891

Your pamphlets and your letters seem to me to indicate that you are not acquainted with the amount of routine and of requirement which now exists in Harvard College.

There is really a great deal of both; enough it seems to me to give the necessary amount of support to the will of the average boy of nineteen. You evidently have a faith in what you call drill or discipline in early life which I lack. Perhaps you have in your mind some kind of drill or discipline which I have never imagined. The West Point or Naval Academy method seems to me absolutely inapplicable to a college. When you were in Harvard College there was a required attendance at morning and evening prayers, and at three recitations a day — one in the morning, one at noon, and one in the afternoon — and this attendance was quite strictly enforced. What sort of drill or discipline have you in mind? The German University has absolutely none; the Scottish University has next to none; Oxford and Cambridge have a curious monastic mediæval inheritance of gates barred at night; but this arrangement is well known to be wholly useless as a protection against vice. No American college, so far as I know, possesses any system which could fairly be called drill in your sense. You reject the old-fashioned methods of Harvard College. What method of drill or discipline do you recommend?

You want the Faculty or me to lay out an advisable course of study for the great majority of boys. I must confess that I cannot lay out such a course of study, and I believe the Faculty would confess a like inability. My reason is that a given course of study will fit very few boys. As a rule, I have to arrange a course of study for each individual boy who consults me. I do not succeed in

using even a dozen types of college course. I find that the best college course for each youth has to be expressly contrived for him with careful consideration of his school studies, his purposes in life, his inheritances, and his tastes. In my opinion to direct a hundred boys upon the same course of study for four years in college is a careless, lazy, unintelligent, unconscientious method of dealing with them, and I will never again be responsible for the selection of a course of study intended for any such use in college. I am willing, and the Faculty is willing to take any amount of trouble to advise and direct the individual boy; but I will not lay out any uniform course for boys by the hundred, or even by the score.

You ask my advice with regard to publishing your views. So far as hurting the College goes I think you may safely publish whatever you wish. If you ask me whether I think your contribution is a valuable one, I shall have to say no. Your fundamental ideas have been published a hundred times during the last twenty years by all sorts of persons, from Dr. McCosh and Dr. Porter down; and you, while rejecting both the past and the present methods of Harvard College, make no practical suggestion as to the sort of discipline which you desire. — Very truly yours....

With the letters to Stickney belongs part of a letter to Edwin H. Abbot dated February 8, 1889. The College was just then being criticized in the Board of Overseers and among the alumni, especially in New York, for not

supervising the undergraduates closely enough and for allowing them too much latitude in the selection of their studies. Somebody said he'd rather send his son to Hell than to Harvard, and for a few weeks the phrase flew about. The letter to Abbot is concerned more with discipline than freedom of election in studies.

To Edwin H. Abbot

Feb. 8, 1889

DEAR ABBOT, — I am much obliged to you for your letter of yesterday. It has made me reflect upon the difference between your view (which somewhat resembles that of Albert Stickney) and mine, and I should like to impart to you some of the results of my reflection.

I agree with you that students, as well as men who are at work in the world, need to get up early, to have stated engagements, and to work systematically. All these things seem to me quite as necessary to success in College life as in professional or business life. Therefore I like as little as you do the current notion that a young man has no stated engagements or prescribed duties at Harvard College, but is free to go, or not to go, to recitations and lectures, to get up or to lie abed, to spend his evenings in mere amusement, and to absent himself from Cambridge when he pleases. I do not think it well for a student to indulge in that kind of license; but I think the College should train him to control himself in this respect, rather than try to compel him to systematic labor by the use of artificial penalties which bear no resemblance to any-

thing he will encounter in real life. I think I differ from you and Stickney in regard to the best method of training a student's will, in order that he may become a man capable of strenuous, systematic labor. At school boys are held to the stated performance of daily tasks under the eye of the master; and they want to get a good mark three or four times a day, and an approbation card at the end of the week. When they come to College their life should more closely resemble the professional life or the business life which they are soon to lead, and their leading motives should resemble the motives of adults, rather than those of school boys.... Nevertheless, some of the motives to strenuous exertion and steady application which the College sets before the student should be remote. The student should work diligently and steadily in order to master a subject which interests him, or to develop his powers, or to get a degree at the end of four years; just as an oarsman trains for nine months, and subjects himself to all sorts of privations and irksome labors, in order to win a race next June. The student should see far ahead of him a worthy object, and should give himself day by day to the labors required for the attainment of that object. To my thinking, college training effective for the future ends of business and professional life is only to be got in this way....

It seems to me that our present difficulties result in part from wide-spread misinformation about the College, and in part from the Faculty's neglect of the welfare of the lowest four per cent of the College classes. The Faculty

have been for years much absorbed in developing and improving the instruction of the College; for they believe that the continued prosperity of the institution absolutely depends upon that development. They have neglected to do all that can be done for the last ten in each class, and for some negligent fellows who are a little above the bottom of the class. I should say the same thing of myself. I have given but very little attention to the needs of the shirks and the malingerers. I ought to have given more, and am giving more. The recommendations of the Overseers, except that about a roll-call,¹ are useful; and the Faculty can, in my opinion, add some other measures which will be decided improvements. We can begin our recitations earlier. We can put the most numerous attended classes into the early morning hours; and we can be much more vigilant about absentees and shirks. We can get out of one or two ruts. For instance, we are in a rut at least forty years old in regard to absence returns. They have long been made only once a week; but there is no reason why we shouldn't have them daily. In the Board of Overseers the whole discussion turned upon the roll-call question; and I am glad to read that you do not approve of that proposal. If you happen to meet Beaman (he is close by you in Wall St.) please tell him that you didn't mean to express approval of that particular method....

The reader will recall that James Bryce had recently published "The American Commonwealth."

¹ Daily roll-calls of the whole College had been proposed by the Overseers.

To James Bryce

April 2, 1889

... You have had an eventful year. To issue the best book ever written on a great subject of perennial interest, and to win a wife also within six months is a remarkable combination of achievements.

The first makes you famous, the second happy. May the happiness be even more lasting than the fame.

I received your book with gratitude and read it with wonder and delight. It is a marvel of accuracy, good judgment, and correct observation. Six months before I read your treatise I had reread DeTocqueville, and the contrast between your work and his was very interesting to me. The proportion of fact and observation to theory and speculation is much higher in your book than in his, and your method is at once more comprehensive and more compact than his. Your method is Darwinism in the field of politics.

... Can you manage to be here on the last Wednesday in June this year or next, so that we can give you the amplest possible LL.D.? If you could come next year we should hope to get an address from you for our queer literary and annual dinner society called ΦBK. This year Mr. Phelps gives the address.

We are all well and thriving, although often overworked.

The University keeps gaining force and influence, both at home and abroad. The same mail which brought your welcome note brought two letters from Tokyo, one

thanking me for selecting a law professor for the Imperial University, and the other saying that Kentaro Kanéko, Secretary of the Privy Council, who drew the new Constitution for Japan, attributes his success in great measure to the training which he received in our Law School.

Please present my compliments and congratulations to Miss Ashton and believe me. Very truly yours....

The next letter, with its rapid and orderly review of five points, does more than remind the reader of a change that has occurred since the nineties. It shows very well how generously, somewhat dogmatically, always hopefully Eliot was wont to reason.

Nov. 21, 1892

DEAR SIR, — In reply to your letter of November 15th I beg to say that I do not think immigration should be restricted at all, except to prevent the coming in of criminals, paupers and diseased persons. My reasons are briefly these: —

First; in my opinion every healthy and honest laborer, male or female, and every healthy child added to the population is a gain to the country. The population of the United States is still a very sparse one, and there is ample room for hundreds of millions of people in addition to our present population. We export great quantities of cereals and provisions which we had better consume at home. Over immense areas in the United States great natural resources are still undeveloped for lack of human labor.

Secondly; the restriction of immigration by the present occupants of the United States seems to me a peculiarly ungenerous and ungrateful proposal; because these present occupants are all themselves descendants from immigrants within very recent times. Moreover, they are descended from just the sort of people that now desire to come to this country, namely, — poor mechanics, trades-people, farmers, and peasants who are more ambitious and enterprising than most of their neighbors and friends. Even those Americans who are fond of boasting that they are descended from English stock, are merely claiming descent from a mixed people made up of Danes, Norwegians, Dutch, Germans, Normans and Saxons — a veritable ethnological conglomerate very like that which is now forming on a larger scale in the United States.

Thirdly; in reply to the objection that the suffrage is being impaired in quality by the admixture of large numbers of foreigners who have no experience of free institutions, I should say that, if this allegation be true, the appropriate remedy is to be found in a change of our naturalization laws, which, through the competitive action of both political parties, now give the foreigner very prompt admission to the suffrage; but against the lengthening of the period of residence before naturalization, it can be urged that the ballot is an educating influence, and that the education of the foreigner for judicious political action does not begin till he votes.

Fourthly; it seems to me altogether probable that the immigrants will in the future present a constantly higher

average of intelligence, skill and education; first, because the public school systems in European countries become constantly more effective; and secondly, because in most of the countries from which the immigrants come the political institutions become always freer and freer.

Lastly; all the European races seem to me capable of complete assimilation under the influence of free schools, free churches, equal laws, and democratic social mobility. The real difficulty concerning immigration relates to races which cannot be assimilated — like the African, Chinese, and Japanese. Very truly yours....

A letter to a correspondent who shall be unnamed indicates sufficiently what the questions were to which it replied.

July 13, 1893

MY DEAR SIR, — I am not a minister as your address to me implies. I am a layman educated in Science, and was a teacher of Mathematics and Chemistry for the first fifteen years after leaving college.

I do not understand the chief object of churches to be the “saving” of souls. I should say that their chief object was to make men and women happier and better in this world; and as I believe them to do this, I am in favor of spending money on them.

Your questions about a soul are of course unanswerable and to most persons they would seem absurd. There are plenty of forces in this world which we can neither weigh nor measure. Human love, for instance is an intangible

force which produces tangible and visible effects. It brings up every child through its long infancy of twenty years. Indeed there are forces of whose vigorous action we have daily evidence, but of whose nature we not only know nothing but can imagine nothing. Electricity is one such force, and the combination of powers called vital force is another.

I do not believe that annihilation is better than bliss. It is probably to be preferred to permanent woe.

Your mental attitude seems to me to be that of a dogmatist and not that of an inquirer. You have apparently made up your mind in the negative on many questions which men are incompetent to decide in either the affirmative or the negative. Why should any man expect to know what he is, whence produced, and to what end? We know that we live now; that we can tell right from wrong, good from evil, beautiful from ugly; and that we ought to pursue the right, the good and the beautiful. That is enough to guide us to the right conduct of life here and now. As to another life beyond the death of the body, we may be sure that the best way to secure it or prepare for it is to do our best to-day. That is the way we make wise preparation for to-morrow, not knowing absolutely that there will be any to-morrow for us.

I have answered your letter because I have kept it till my vacation. In term-time at the University I should not have answered it. Probably the dozen men who have not answered you have been busy men who thought your inquiries futile.

You will please regard this letter as for yourself alone.
Very truly yours...

It was astonishing to see how much information Eliot could pick up about people who interested him, how he managed to keep watch of their careers, and how solicitous he was for their welfare. Consider, by way of example, a note to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler who was, at this time, a professor at Columbia.

Jan. 13, 1894

DEAR MR. BUTLER, — I have just been looking over the Announcement of the University Faculty of Philosophy at Columbia. It is a very interesting and admirable document; but the one thing of pressing interest which I learn from it is this; that you are announced in it for more work than any human being can prudently attempt. In addition to the work here announced, you edit a review, write freely for magazines and newspapers, and have a good deal of committee and other administrative work to attend to. Moreover, you live in New York City — a wearing place. You have had two distinct warnings against overwork. As you are a useful person in American education, and ought to have twenty years of productive life before you, I venture to remonstrate against your excess in labor. Very truly yours....

Apparently Dr. Butler replied that there was no reason to be apprehensive. But Eliot, as usual, when a good cause was at stake, refused to retreat.

Jan. 22, 1894

DEAR MR. BUTLER, — ... I observed the arrangement of your courses in pairs; but seven meetings a week — which is what I figured your work at — are altogether too many for a person that has your other duties. Seminaries are very exhausting if the students are competent and eager. Then the subjects of your lectures are difficult, requiring invention and an alert, stimulating manner of teaching. I adhere to the opinion which I expressed in my last about the unreasonableness of your labors. Very truly yours....

Two more examples may be taken from the reports of two former students. The first is a quotation from Mr. John Jay Chapman: —

“When I was half-way through college my family lost money. I was on the verge of leaving Harvard. News of the situation somehow reached Eliot, and he sent for me and offered me tutoring. It appeared that a certain young loafer (whom I will not name, as he became through the incident and has remained ever since, a valued friend) required the services of a mental puncher of some sort to force him to work. It must be remembered that I did not belong to the working classes in college; and never dreamed of tutoring anyone. I really was not competent to do proper tutoring. But this kind of a boosting job was within my powers. I had not known that it was within my powers, but Doctor Eliot knew it; and I did such wonders with my young renegade, and he gained

such unheard-of marks in the ensuing examinations, that both he and I have lived on the memory of those intellectual triumphs ever since. At the time I speak of there must have been a thousand undergraduates in the academic department, and Doctor Eliot had the reputation of not knowing one man from another. This anecdote is one out of hundreds. In every walk of life, in all his dealings with men, Doctor Eliot was doing such things every day. His greatness lay in his handling of men.”¹ The second is from Dr. L. R. G. Crandon (H.C. 1894):

“In my Junior year, the second term bill found me ‘up against it’ with insufficient funds. For the first (and last) time in my life it seemed necessary to borrow money. I studied the Catalogue on this matter and then had a conference with that good friend of us all, Mr. Briggs. His final advice was, ‘Come here to-morrow at ten to ask President Eliot for money from the Loan Fund.’

“Next day at ten I knocked on the President’s door in University Hall, went in, in response to his command, and said, ‘Good morning, Sir,’ with a dry mouth.

“He said, ‘What can I do for you’ in that wonderful voice that none of us can forget. I felt better right away and was able to tell him, I hope coherently, that I would like to borrow fifty dollars from the Loan Fund. He did not ask me about my family or their circumstances. He did not ask me if I had borrowed money before. He replied without any delay, ‘You may have the money,’ and he signed and handed me an order on the Bursar.

¹ “President Eliot” in *Memories and Milestones*, 173.

“I made my heart-felt thanks and started to leave, when he said, ‘Pray be seated.’ Then he proceeded, to my amazement, to say in effect: ‘I am told that you cook and eat in your room. Now I don’t think that that is at all bad for you if you get the right food and enough of it. When I was in College I did the same. Did you ever make veal loaf? That, if made from sufficiently mature and sufficiently cooked veal is one of the best things you could have, because there is no waste. This is the way I used to make it.’ He then told me how to pick the veal, how to cook it slowly, with such evaporation that the soup would turn into jelly later, then how to cut it up and press it with one pan inside another and eat it cold. He had given me a pad and pencil with which to make notes and I did so. He then stood up, took me by the hand and said ‘We shall expect you to pay back this loan with interest after you have graduated and become prosperous.’ ”

Eliot took an especial interest in students who were “working their way” through College, or who showed, in any other manner, the qualities of character that enable men to overcome difficulties. He informed himself about them very minutely; and he remembered. Twice at least during the ensuing twenty years, he reminded Dr. Crandon of the “veal-loaf” interview.

Among the Eliot papers there was found a loose sheet upon which the President had apparently jotted down “points” for an address to students. Perhaps he was pre-

paring one of his memorable talks to the Freshman Class. The memorandum is undated. It shall close this chapter of quotations. One cannot read it without seeing Eliot's own reflection in his precepts.

What possessions or acquisitions in College lead to success in after life?

1. An available body. Not necessarily the muscles of an athlete. Good circulation, digestion, power to sleep, and alert steady nerves.

2. Power of sustained mental labor.

3. The habit of independent thinking on books, prevailing customs, current events. (University training the opposite of military or industrial.)

4. The habit of quiet, unobtrusive, self-regulated conduct, not accepted from others or influenced by the vulgar breath.

5. Reticent, reserved, not many acquaintances, but a few intimate friends. Belonging to no societies perhaps. Carrying in his face his character so plainly to be seen there by the most casual observer, that nobody ever makes to him a dishonorable proposal.

CHAPTER XIII

1890-1900

The State of the University in the Early Nineties Contrasted with its Condition in 1869 — Athletics — The Three Year Question — The Ripening of the Harvest — Eliot's Growth — His New Relation to his Colleagues — Celebration of his Twenty-fifth Anniversary — Death of his Son Charles — His Adoption by the General Public — His Ideas — Inscriptions — The Effect of his Presence.

To what stage of its development had Harvard now been brought, and how had Eliot's own situation altered? Twenty years that had passed between 1869 and 1890 had made such great differences that it would be impossible to express them fairly except in terms of contrast.

The Graduate Department, non-existent in 1869, which Eliot had wanted ardently to create although for a while he did not see clearly how to bring it into being, was at last flourishing. The instruction was correlated with that offered to undergraduates in the College in a reasonable manner. Its influence was beginning to be comparable to that of its younger but precocious rival, Johns Hopkins; and its growth was beginning to be rapid and confident. The reputation of the Harvard Ph.D. degree was now second to none.¹

In the Law School the appointment of Langdell had

¹ Although it would be a mistake to attach too much importance to statistics, the reader is advised to consider the figures that are tabulated in Appendix C.

been vindicated brilliantly. The School had proved to the satisfaction of its Faculty that its policy was sound, and it had also convinced most of the original skeptics in the Board of Overseers and in the legal profession. Whether the Dean or the President had been the more eager about the program which converted it from an institution which the American Law Review stigmatized as "almost a disgrace to Massachusetts" into a school of jurisprudence as well as an admirable training place for practitioners would be difficult to decide. Langdell and his Faculty wrought the change step by step, but Eliot presided over their meetings with hardly ever an absence, fought their battles in the Corporation and the Board of Overseers, accepted full responsibility for their policy before the alumni and the community and defended each foot of ground over which the School advanced. When it was decided to require students to spend three years in the School, fifty per cent was added to the time and expense previously required for a legal education and the age at which a graduate began to earn his livelihood was advanced by a year. The classes promptly shrank in size, and the School's popularity and influence seemed to be in jeopardy. For a while the lawyers who thought it was becoming too theoretical in its methods were probably in the majority. They said it was making a cult of science and forgetting that the law is the most practical of professions. It was not easy to answer them until the new plan had been tested by several years of trial and experience. But by 1890 the men who had been

graduated from three years of instruction by the case-method were proving in the competition of professional life that their training had been superior to any other. It was then in order for other law schools to imitate the methods that were no longer new at Harvard; and this, after a few years, they did.

An experiment that had been tried in the Law School, in the face of doubt and criticism, had succeeded admirably. James Barr Ames had been appointed to teach law although he had never engaged in practice, and he had more than justified Langdell's and Eliot's confidence. Eliot had straightway followed this precedent by appointing other men who lacked a background of professional practice to the faculties of the Law School, Scientific School and Medical School. Thus the number of teachers who gave their full time to teaching had been increased in these schools. In 1883 a physiologist who had never practised medicine had been made Dean of the Medical School, — Dr. Henry P. Bowditch. Nothing could have proved more pointedly that the School had become an institution for the teaching of medical science instead of one which an association of practitioners conducted for the purpose of licensing men cheaply to go out and learn the art of healing at the bedsides of their patients.

In the Lawrence Scientific School Eliot's question, how to induce the *École Centrale* education and the ordinary American college education to understand and respect each other, had been solved insofar as there was no longer

any perceptible difference in Cambridge between the College students who were pursuing their way to an A.B. degree and the Scientific School students who were candidates for the S.B. The School had, to most intents and purposes, been absorbed into the College. Men who wished to follow scientific courses, other than purely technical ones, usually preferred to enroll as students in the College.

The College might truly be said to have been completely made over and regenerated. Its students, instead of attending classes and reciting from text-books like schoolboys as they had done in sixty-nine, went to lectures as did the students of a Continental university. Instead of being herded into recitations on a few subjects that were prescribed, they enjoyed a freedom to choose their studies that was, with one or two unimportant exceptions, limited only by the natural principle that the elements of a subject must have been learned before advanced work could be undertaken. A sophomore no longer went to his classes always with other sophomores and a junior with other juniors. The elective system and the departmental organization of instruction had softened the former rigid distinction between the three upper classes. Sophomores, juniors, seniors and graduate students now found themselves meeting together in the more advanced courses. The old disciplinary regulations had been abolished so completely that they had been forgotten. If a student attended the lectures in the courses in which he enrolled with fair regularity, passed his ex-

aminations and did not make himself conspicuously disorderly or uproarious, he was free to spend his time very much as he chose.

The elective system was perhaps at its best. The variety of subjects taught and the provisions for advanced work in all the departments were rich enough to give almost anybody an opportunity to piece together the elements of whatever special education he desired. But the catalogue had not yet become a too bewildering maze. The principle of the elective system was now enjoying high prestige. It was being applied in other colleges all over the country. In fact, it was becoming the fashion of the day in higher education.

In the year 1889-90 a considerable constitutional revision was effected. The College had thus far had its own faculty, the Scientific School its own. In the Graduate Department the giving of degrees had been regulated by the Academic Council. But meanwhile students who were enrolled in the College, Scientific School, and Graduate Department were sitting side by side in almost every lecture room. With the growth of the whole University the administrative duties which devolved upon the little faculties of the sixties appropriately enough had increased until they could no longer be discharged satisfactorily by the process of discussion and vote in the large bodies of 1890. So the separate faculties of the College and Scientific School were abolished and one "Faculty of Arts and Sciences" was created in their place. The Graduate Department became the Graduate School.

The conduct of instruction was also entrusted to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and the Academic Council ceased to function as a body concerned with the awarding of degrees. To relieve the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of administrative worries, small committees called Administrative Committees were created for the College, the Scientific School, and the Graduate School. In each of the last two Schools the office of Dean was created. Thus was established "an organization practically convenient, historically legitimate, philosophically just." It was the last considerable constitutional reform of Eliot's administration, and it has worked satisfactorily to this day.

Eliot had a passion for "enriching the curriculum" and in looking about him he had reason to be gratified.

On every side the University was budding, sprouting and growing. To be convinced of it one has but to read two or three successive Annual Reports concerning the College, the Theological School, the Schools of Law and Medicine and Dentistry, the Museums of Comparative Zoölogy, Geology and Ethnology, the Bussey Institution, Arnold Arboretum, and Botanic Garden, and the Astronomical Observatory. Only the unfortunate little School of Veterinary Medicine languished incurably, for nobody would come forward to give it the funds it needed. The College and Graduate Department had expanded and sprouted in so many different directions that they were offering more than four times as many courses as had been offered in 1870. The total number of teachers in

all departments of the University, including assistants holding short appointments, was 242 as contrasted with 70 during the first year of Eliot's presidency. His policy was to use every available dollar and every resource. His chief and chronic difficulty in every quarter was therefore to find more money, more men, more equipment.

During the seventies the agitation for the higher education of women had frequently taken the form of efforts to force open the doors of the men's colleges, and these efforts had presented troublesome and contentious questions to the governing boards. At one time Eliot had favored the admission of women to the Medical School, but he had found its faculty obdurately resistant. Otherwise it had been his policy to do what he could to encourage the establishment of separate colleges for women. The so-called Harvard Annex, which was founded in 1879 and was rechristened Radcliffe College in 1894, had solved the problem locally, and Eliot had cordially aided the Annex.¹

In only two quarters did the President see occasion for serious anxiety. Athletics were making more and more trouble. The age at which young men were being turned out to begin the pursuit of their careers was rising too high.

¹ "[Without the goodwill and spiritual support of President Eliot] the Annex could not have come into being; without their constancy, it would soon have come to an end... He was not the founder of the new institution — not the founder, but the foundation." (L. B. R. Briggs, "An Experiment in Faith"; *Atlantic Monthly*, Jan., 1929.)

The first fact about athletics was that intercollegiate contests in football, baseball and rowing had become popular and exciting. In the beginning they had been arranged by the students, with some encouragement from an enthusiastic but often indiscreet element among the alumni, and without official supervision. Practically speaking, there had been no eligibility regulations, and, in baseball especially, players who were undeniably professionals had represented Harvard and other colleges.

Although Eliot was a strong advocate of physical culture and believed that sports provide it in the best way, he preferred the field and track sports, cross-country walking, sailing, riding (including polo), tennis and rowing to baseball and football. This drew the line against the very games that were most popular. The discrimination was further emphasized by the evident fact that he did not attach much importance to the winning of intercollegiate matches. As part of his preparation for life, said Eliot on one occasion, a young man should qualify himself to walk twenty-five miles in a day, to ride a horse, to swim one mile, to sail, to row a boat. Rowing, once his own specialty, was the only popular intercollegiate sport in which he showed an interest. Mr. Witter Bynner was entirely accurate when he wrote the last two lines of these verses about the celebration of a football victory:

“So we marched with tingling feet,
Rousing Cambridge to the beat
Of the figures of the score as to a drumming.
And the President and Dean went through their paces,



A HORSEMAN ON MULEBACK
President Eliot in California

Made us speeches from their porches
With our torches
In their faces.

The President spoke nicely, but before he was half through
Was devoting his attention altogether to the crew."

"Baseball," said Eliot in 1883, "is only fit for professional players, because success in it depends chiefly upon one man, the pitcher, who must needs be professionally expert."¹ To pitch a curved ball seemed to him to be a resort to a low form of cunning. Coaching the runner on bases, and interlarding instructions to him with gibes intended to rattle the other side, offended his taste. When, on a certain occasion, a baseball player was put on probation because of a poor record in his classes, Eliot remarked that there was no occasion to regret that he was thereby automatically put off the Nine, because it was admitted that he was a player who resorted to deception on the diamond. Professors Briggs and Wendell, much puzzled by this, went to Eliot to ask what warrant he had for such a statement. "Why!" said the President, drawing himself up and speaking in his most impressive manner, "Why! They boasted of his making a feint to throw a ball in one direction and then *throwing it in* ANOTHER!" The manly way to play football, he maintained, would be to attack the strongest part of the opponents' line.² One day when a football game with Yale was going on, and the Harvard crowd was singing a song in which occur

¹ Speech to Harvard Club of San Francisco, Oct. 9, 1883. H. U. files, Box 55.

² Briggs, L. B. R., in *Atlantic Monthly* (Nov., 1929), 600.

the words "Three cheers for Harvard and Down with Yale," Eliot remarked "Of course it's right to be enthusiastic for your own side; but why sing a song that's rude to our guests? Why wouldn't it be better to sing 'Three cheers for Harvard and *one* for Yale'?" The song, thus amended, became a favorite with his grandchildren, to be sung derisively, in frolicking moments, for their own and their grandfather's refreshment; but the amendment was never offered to the student body.

Needless to say the undergraduates felt that he did not understand their sports, and they did not agree that in the main he was an intelligent critic. In his relations with them and with many of the alumni the consequent discord over athletics assumed a greater importance than it rightly deserved. It more or less caused them to overlook other achievements which should have made Eliot popular, and it served to perpetuate the impression that he was a stiff and unsympathetic schoolmaster sort of person while everything else was tending to obliterate the notion. If he had been able to approach the regulation of athletics with a little more art and a little better intuition of undergraduate motivation he would perhaps have made more rapid headway in reforming intercollegiate competitions. But even as it was, and largely because of his persistence, Harvard usually led in the movement for reform. When, in 1888, she inaugurated a system of control by a committee composed at first of members of the faculty and later of faculty members, alumni, and undergraduates, she began a practice which has since

been widely copied by other colleges. As soon as such committees had come into being in several colleges, it became possible to formulate and enforce better playing rules and to eliminate professional players.

The age at which men were being graduated into practical life was in Eliot's view a matter of moment to the country as well as to the universities. When he graduated from College at the age of nineteen he was not much older than the average of his class. Since then the age level had been rising steadily and in 1890 students who took their Bachelor of Arts degrees averaged 22 years and 7 months. This, though perhaps not much later than the age at which the degree was taken in other American colleges, was later than that at which it was taken in any other country and was "too late for the best interests of the individuals who aspire to it and of the institutions which confer it." ¹ At the same time the courses in the professional schools had been lengthened, — in the Law School to three years, in the Medical School to three or four years, according to the option of the student. (After 1892 the Medical School required four years' attendance.) Accordingly, the average man who entered the legal profession could not begin practice until he was twenty-six years old, and the average doctor did not get his degree until he was twenty-six or twenty-seven. The effects of this retardation were especially unfortunate among men who should have entered the Graduate

¹ *Ann. Rep.*, 1888-89, p. 21.

School to prepare themselves for the teaching profession, because in that profession no particular standard of fitness to begin teaching was generally enforced.

The situation tended to divert a certain number of boys from Harvard into colleges where they could begin their legal or medical studies before they had earned their Bachelors' degrees, or to carry them into professional schools that offered a shorter course than was thought necessary at Harvard, or to send them into the teaching ranks with a meagre preparation.

Lastly, it seemed an unfortunate thing for the professions themselves and for the community that men should not be able to begin to earn their livings earlier.

This matter of ages gradually assumed in Eliot's mind an importance beyond that of any other question of general policy in higher education.

What solution could be found?

For twenty years he had been endeavoring to establish thoroughly rigorous standards of preparation for the professions. The Faculties of Law and Medicine were now of the opinion that a good legal or medical education could not be compressed into less than three or four years. To go back on the main principle and disregard their judgment was not thinkable. Yet these Faculties were so strongly of the opinion that men were entering the professional schools too late that they formally asked the College to adopt measures to promote earlier graduation. On the other hand, Eliot's conception of the University was that professional training should follow and should

on no account displace the liberal education which it was the College's function to provide. It was his policy to turn all professional schools into true graduate departments. This principle could not be abandoned either.¹

In the third place all endeavors to induce the secondary schools to fit boys for admission to college at an earlier age had thus far been unavailing. The College had raised its entrance requirements in order to throw back into the schools the studies which were not fit to be carried on advantageously by college methods, and the schools had, to be sure, accepted responsibilities thus transferred to their shoulders. But they had not sufficiently accelerated their own work. Instead of preparing boys to pass the Harvard entrance examinations at seventeen they were sending them to college at an average age of nearly nineteen. Furthermore Eliot was inclined to doubt whether the transition from school to college had better be made by most boys before the age of eighteen.

The solution which he finally adopted as the logical one threw the whole task of adjustment upon the college. If the College could do anything by revising its own curriculum it need not wait for the secondary schools to improve, nor obstruct the projects of the professional schools.

¹ At the inauguration of President Butler in 1902 Eliot said:

"Until lately the true relation between professional courses and cultural courses found no expression in the organization of any of the American universities. When all the leading universities of the country require a degree in arts or science for admission to their professional schools... an effective support will be given to the Bachelor's degree... and the higher walks of all the professions will be filled with men who have received not only a strenuous professional training, but a broad preliminary culture."

In order to get an A.B. degree the undergraduate was required to pass about eighteen courses.¹ He was allowed to take a greater number if he wanted to. Many an undergraduate did choose to take more. Sometimes he added to the required number for the sake of insuring himself a sufficient final sum total of satisfactory credits, in case he failed somewhere along the road; sometimes he did so from hunger for knowledge. So it seemed that the amount of work which the College regarded as appropriate to the winning of a Bachelor of Arts degree might readily be compressed into three years. If college residence could thus be shortened to three years, one year would be saved to the total educational process. Eliot had now set his heart upon bringing about this reform.

There had been no problem about athletics in 1869. There had then been no reason to think that it might become desirable to squeeze the College course into three years. These were new matters for discussion. The reforms Eliot had set himself to accomplish twenty years before were all either in the main perfected, or happily launched. The foundations of the first American university, conceived in a large sense, were laid securely.

¹ The word "course" as used here and elsewhere with a similar meaning will not bewilder anyone who is familiar with Harvard or with other American colleges similarly conducted, but for other readers Mr. Morison's definition (*Development of Harvard University 1869-1929*, p. xxxii) may be helpful. "The term *course*... means a unit of instruction in which the instructor meets his students for two or three hours a week for a lecture, recitation, or discussion, assigns prescribed reading, laboratory or field work, or written work such as essays, reports and theses, or a combination of these; examines them at stated intervals on the subject of the lectures *and* the assigned study; and finally assigns a grade..."

Nothing less than a cataclysm could now have arrested its development.

If the University had grown and changed, so, too, had Eliot. In 1870 the sceptical estimate of him had been "merely a good organizer and administrator." By 1890 it was evident that he was full of worldly sagacity and that his judgment of men was nice and usually sound. In his memory there was accumulated such a store of information about individuals in academic walks of life, in the business world of New England, and in the outer world to which Harvard's sons had graduated, as few men ever possess. It was comparable for minuteness and completeness to the sort of knowledge that a professional politician or party manager collects. As it concerned people who were more than ordinarily instructive types to know, it had mellowed his judgment of men and broadened his knowledge of the world. Sitting for a score of years, not in the faculty of one department only, but with the faculties of all, and also in all the meetings of the Governing Boards, he had enjoyed extraordinary opportunities to observe medical men, lawyers, engineers, scientists, economists, historians, and literary scholars, and to learn about their special points of view, desires and professional ideals.

He had become a wonderful listener — not simply because he could be patient or because he could sit still and think his own thoughts while you talked. Professor R. B. Perry has put this very well in saying that his idea of con-

versation was that two individuals should alternately speak and listen and that when his turn came his listening was not mere silence but a form of activity. Sitting very erect on the end of his spine with hands joined in his lap, making no movement except that he revolved his thumbs around each other faster or slower, he faced his interlocutor and seemed to be hearing with his eyes as well as his ears. "He listened with his mind, and attentively considered what you had to say while you said it. You felt flattered, but somewhat appalled. You often wished that you had thought it over a little more carefully before you brought it to him. If he had been President Wilson he would have listened to M. Taylor Pyne and Henry Cabot Lodge." At the end of an interview the man who had talked to him felt that he had had his say. He might be greatly disappointed by the answer he received, but he did not "feel diminished." This gift of listening should be credited to Eliot as a form of tact.

The word "tact" is often applied to what is really nothing but a good-natured addiction to the practice of presenting to different people the different aspects of a question that may best please their several tastes. To this form of self indulgence Eliot did not yield. Indeed, he leaned over backward to avoid it. As a consequence, he had by now established a valuable reputation for conscientious candor. Professor Briggs has recounted how, when Eliot gave him his first appointment he added, "This appointment is for *one* year. Mr. Croswell and Mr. J. H. Wheeler are abroad; and the College will

employ either of those persons in preference to you.” That probably seemed gratuitously rough to Mr. Briggs; but there remained no room for misunderstanding later. The incident was typical. So Eliot was trusted; — trusted to be direct, not to conceal the worst, not to go round about, and to deal straight on all occasions. To be sure, he is credited with having remarked to somebody who was accepting the presidency of another college, “You will be accused of lying when you are a college president. They will convict you of it, too; they have convicted me.” But it may be questioned whether this ought not to be attributed to somebody else, for it does not sound like Eliot’s kind of humor, and certainly no one who trafficked with so many men of so many shades and degrees of inexperience was ever troubled by the cropping up in his path of so few misunderstandings. He was still like a cedar post, always in one place; and there was no doubt about the place.

Eliot’s patience in the presence of opposition was exemplary. He could sit through a discussion and hear himself criticized and appear as calm as though what was being said concerned nobody nearer to him than Mahomet. Once, after a College Faculty meeting during which a particularly disagreeable attack was launched against him, it was discovered that an arm of the chair upon which his hand had rested had been broken in his grip. But his feeling had not been betrayed openly. The fact that he harbored no resentments and descended to no retaliatory tactics was by this time perfectly under-

stood. There is one bundle of papers in his files from which a good illustration may be cited. Barrett Wendell and Eliot were too opposite to agree, and their differences were not easy to dismiss because Wendell could lead a forlorn hope as bravely as a Don Quixote. "You will understand," said Eliot while Wendell still held only a temporary appointment, "that your opposition to me will in no way affect your chances of promotion." Many years afterwards Eliot told a committee upon whom he was urging the propriety of paying a compliment to Wendell, that he had often had to defend him from the assaults of persons who objected to his continuance on the Harvard staff and had done so although he "disliked very much things that Wendell said, measures that he advocated, and his impetuous assaults upon measures that Eliot advocated, because throughout his college career he respected Wendell's independence, sincerity, and frankness, though not his judgment." The papers that are before me show Wendell, magnanimous on his side, writing to say, "...Your methods in debate have always seemed to me admirable beyond any others in my experience. They are fair to the point of chivalrousness. That is one reason why, to little men, they are so hopelessly overwhelming..." And again, at a time when Wendell imagined that the Corporation was likely to deny him a re-appointment, he wrote, "...I need not add, I hope, fresh assurance that I am sincerely sensible of the frank kindness and consideration you have shown me throughout my eighteen years of service; and that, should you

decide my usefulness to the college ended or waning, I shall cheerfully accept your decision as thoughtfully made for what seem to you the best interests of Harvard." Such correspondence does honor to both sides.

Eliot had learned that people who might be antipathetic to him, and their strange pursuits, must have room made for them. This is not to deny that he had blindnesses and limitations that he never outgrew, or even to pretend that he could recognize his own limitations clearly enough to make allowances for them all, but rather to intimate that he made unusual progress. The late George Bendelari, a witty Neapolitan who was an instructor for a while, had his eye on one of Eliot's limitations when he explained why it was natural for the President to refuse him a reappointment. "When he looks out of his window in the morning he expects to see me grinding a hand-organ on his doorstep." But Bendelari was mistaken if he imagined that the President regarded him as too queer a fish for his pond; there were others, stranger still. Eliot's capacity to respond to the appeal of the plastic arts was probably next to none at all; but he was the first president of an American college to provide for the teaching of the Fine Arts, and he saw that Norton was a man with a mission almost as soon as Norton recognized it himself. Perhaps, as somebody has said, he rated Whittier more highly than he did Homer; certainly a poor poem with a good moral charmed him, while a beautiful one with none left him unmoved. He could exclaim, after listening to a reading of Chaucer's "Man

of Lawes Tale," "Can you give me any reason, Mr. Briggs, why that should be preserved as literature? There is no poetry in it. *The man is a miserable rascal!*"¹ But it would have distressed him to think that there was nobody in the Harvard English Department who could offer a good course on Chaucer. He might say, as he did, to a painter who praised one of Romney's portraits of Lady Hamilton, "That woman should never have been painted."² But he was a devoted promoter of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. So men of quite different tastes from his own found in him a helpful promoter of their designs.

He was called parsimonious and it appears that his judgment concerning salaries could hardly be called generous.³ There was, to be sure, never enough money to satisfy his ambitions for the enrichment of the curriculum. But, thriving as he did on the hardest work and the longest hours and finding it easy to live plainly and to manage frugally his own affairs, he made insufficient allowance for the fact that many men were not so well fitted to grow old serenely on a meagre stipend. The best salaries that the University paid were modest and there are more instances than it is pleasant to consider of instructors who were kept waiting for full pay until middle age, or until some

¹ Briggs, L. B. R., "As Seen by a Disciple"; *Atlantic Monthly*, (Nov., 1929), 595.

² Related by Charles S. Hopkinson.

³ This must not be misinterpreted; Eliot gave his own money away generously, especially when members of the University family were overtaken by misfortune.

other institution began to bid against Harvard for their services and reputations. Theodore Richards, recipient of a Nobel Prize in 1914, has left a record of one such bidding that occurred in 1900 or 1901. Richards, the object bid for, and then only an assistant Professor, took his case to the President and Eliot received his news with a kindly smile and spoke, with his customary candor. — “This is a very pleasant affair for everybody concerned. I have always thought that an occurrence of this kind is chiefly useful as an opportunity to improve one’s situation at home. Now, what do you want?”¹ What is an appropriate scale of salaries for university teachers is a question that need not detain us; but it is safe to say that if Eliot had led Harvard to set a more liberal example to the other colleges between the eighties and his retirement in 1909, there would be less ground for saying that teachers’ salaries are too low to-day.²

¹ Richards on Eliot in “Later Years of the Saturday Club,” 11. Part of what Richards wanted was better opportunities for research, and the incident appears to have marked a stage in the enlargement of Eliot’s understanding of such desires.

² In his “Story of Harvard University” Mr. A. S. Pier said (page 199) that Harvard’s professors “are not highly paid.... Perhaps President Eliot was never deeply moved by their pecuniary difficulties. To his ascetic and devoted spirit, asceticism and devotion were required of the teachers of youth, and it mattered little if they were prescribed by poverty instead of being elective.” Protesting mildly against these remarks Eliot said, “As to the pecuniary difficulties of Harvard Professors, I took a keen interest in them, and one of the achievements of my first year as President was the raising of the full Professor’s salary from twenty-four hundred dollars a year, with a precarious grant of six hundred dollars annually, to four thousand dollars a year, and the raising of the Assistant Professor’s salary from fifteen hundred dollars a year to two thousand dollars. I was interested during my whole term in getting all possible improvements made in the

In the Board of Overseers Eliot still encountered more difficulties than anywhere else; but even there his path was now less thorny. It is a fact worth noting concerning that Board that at no time during the forty years of Eliot's presidency were so many as half of its elected members men who had themselves been through Harvard College during Eliot's presidency. Until 1904-05 two-thirds of its membership was always composed of men who had graduated from the College before 1873. The attachment of a considerable portion of their number to the old College being strong, they had fought obstinately to retain the classical requirements, and talked often about preserving the significance of the bachelor of arts degree as a sign that a man had been educated like a gentleman. Before me lies a letter which one conservative overseer addressed to another in 1884 and in which the writer asked why the "remnant of the students who prefer the classical course to any other should not have it." ¹ "And, further, why

College salaries from bottom to top, and the increases were numerous, although never large after the one effected in 1869-70. [In 1889 full professors received \$3500 to \$4500 a year, assistant professors \$2000 to \$3000. In 1899 the lot of some full professors had been further improved by \$500 a year.] Moreover, in 1880 the Corporation adopted in principle a retiring allowance system for all University teachers, and put that system into effect as soon as a sufficient fund applicable to retiring allowances had been accumulated. See my Reports for 1869-70 and 1879-80. This retiring allowance system was the first pension system planned for any American university or American commercial corporation, to the best of my knowledge and belief; but some other institutions put a pension system into operation before Harvard was able to do so. In spite of these facts, however, you are right in saying that I always believed the teacher's and investigator's profession to be one that called for altruistic conceptions of life and duty." (To A. S. Pier, Sept. 23, 1913.)

¹ Under the elective system he could still choose it. The quotation is

should they not keep possession of the old degree? Time has given that degree a well understood meaning and this meaning it should keep. Our enemies seek what they are not entitled to,... Let them have any new and splendid degree which they may ask, but do not let them have (as they wish to have) the old degree which carries a credit in their case undeserved and false. And let us have this decided before we consider which is the true education." But the new college of various and free opportunities had gradually become a living reality by the nineties, and Eliot's ideal, incarnated in its potent presence, had become more comprehensible than it was at the outset. Time had carried off some of the die-hards, and the remaining veterans realized that most of the oncoming generation were in favor of the new order.

When, in the spring of 1894, the twenty-fifth anniversary of Eliot's election offered the suitable occasion, there was a great outpouring of praise and admiration. The quarter century was reviewed in a series of admirable papers by Charles F. Dunbar, Dr. William L. Richardson, C. C. Langdell, and W. R. Thayer in the *Graduates' Magazine*, and in many notices and editorials in the press throughout the country. Faculties passed and presented resolutions. (It gratified Eliot particularly that the resolution of the College Faculty applied the word 'fair' to him.) Congratulatory messages came from other from a letter from Mr. F. E. Parker who had been in the College with the Class of 1841 and who was an Overseer from 1868 to 1879 and again from 1880 to 1886.

institutions. Personal expressions of admiration and gratitude filled his mail for weeks. None pleased him more than a blank sheet of paper which enfolded a single leaf of laurel. A committee of the Alumni struck a gold medal to commemorate the anniversary, and Joseph H. Choate presented it at the Alumni Dinner on Commencement Day. He recalled, rightly enough, for the contrast was too significant to be overlooked, how different had been the feeling that pervaded the Commencement Day of twenty-five years before. Then "the thermometer as usual was in the nineties, but for all that there was a decided chill in the atmosphere. The shoulders of the aged professors, in spite of their silk gowns, were a little cold; the aged alumni from the Class of 1800 down who thronged the hall shivered a little in their shoes; speech after speech by learned and venerable and illustrious orators dwelt exultingly upon the past of Harvard, but without one allusion or word of cheer to the young President who was from that day to control its destinies. At last, as the sun's declining rays shot horizontally across Harvard Hall, the presiding officer called upon one of Mr. Eliot's contemporaries, who had known him from boyhood, and believed in his possibilities, and who was at least willing then as now to say what he thought."¹

Eliot kept protesting that the transformation of the University was not his achievement alone, but the work of many men. In acknowledging the speech with which

¹ *Harv. Grad. Mag.* (Sept., 1894), III, 65. The "contemporary" of 1869 was the orator of 1894.

Choate presented the medal from the Alumni he mentioned some of them by name — Gurney, Langdell, Calvin Ellis of the Medical Faculty, James Mills Peirce, a little group who had turned the Unitarian Divinity School into a non-sectarian theological school, and his fellow members of the Corporation during the first six years, — “the most critical years of the whole period.” With unmistakable sincerity of feeling he claimed for them each and all a large share of the felicitations of the hour. But his protestations could not make him any less its hero. Choate expressed the common understanding that “his brain conceived, his hand had guided, his prudence had controlled, his courage had sustained, the great advance.”

“It is no disparagement of the wisdom and care of the bodies of which the President is the official head” — said Dunbar — “if the results accomplished under such visible leadership — results which have made this administration the most remarkable in the history of the University — are accounted his achievements. The general outline was his, and to a great extent the details were his. That it was impossible to accomplish the work without the coöperation of others makes it none the less the work of him who guided the hands of the rest. . . . After all is said, in the long list of the makers and benefactors of Harvard, no name after that of the Founder is yet engraved so deeply on this enduring monument as that of Charles William Eliot.”¹

¹ “President Eliot’s Administration,” by Charles F. Dunbar; *Harv. Grad. Mag.*, II, 476 (1894).

Three letters that connect themselves with the twenty-fifth anniversary follow.

To Charles Eliot Norton

May 19, 1894

DEAR CHARLES, — There is one sentence in the affectionate note which you sent me to-day that commends itself to me particularly. You wish that “the years to come may be as good for me as those that have passed.” That is a very good wish, for the years that have passed have been very serviceable to me personally. I perceive that I have gained patience, and power to comprehend and sympathize with other people, and moderation, and gentleness. So I am inclined to think that your wish is the best of all the good wishes I have received. Affectionately yours,...

To William James

May 20, 1894

DEAR DR. JAMES, — You carry me back farther than anybody else — to 1861. I can see that I then had some of the same qualities and powers that I have now; but I had little range of observation, no breadth of experience, and small capacity for sympathetic imagination. You and I have, I think, the same fundamental reason for being moderately content with the years that are past: — We have a sense of growth and of increased capacity for useful service. We find our lives enriched and amplified from year to year. So long as that enlarging pro-

cess goes on, we shall be content. If it stops suddenly we shall be content to that date.

I thank you for including in the list of my serviceable qualities "devotion to ideals." I have privately supposed myself to have been pursuing certain educational ideals; but so many excellent persons have described the fruits of the past twenty-five years as lands, buildings, collections, money and thousands of students, that I have sometimes feared that to the next generation I should appear as nothing but a successful Philistine.

As to the next President it seems to me that you might be more hopeful of a good succession. He will not have to do all the things that I have done; for the organization has been greatly improved within fifteen years. At this moment it happens that not a single one of our ten Deans is able-bodied; but that condition can hardly be chronic. With ten robust, energetic Deans, the President might lapse into a figure-head, or a public speaker.

Your coming to the University and your career as a teacher and writer have been among my most solid grounds of satisfaction. So your words of cheer are of especial value to me. Sincerely yours,...

To Edward C. Towne

Aug. 1, 1895

... I do not care to publish a statement of my own about University ideals in your magazine, but I am happy to place at your disposition, for your own use, a brief memorandum on the subject. First, universities are

teachers, store-houses, and searchers for truth. They must teach everything. As Cornell said, "I would found an institution in which any one may study anything." Considered as a store-house, a university must have a great library and great collections. The function of searching for new truth is quite as important as either of the other two. A true university should provide a large number of specialists with a livelihood, and with all the needed facilities for their work.

In addition to these three direct functions, a university has less direct, but still important purposes to fulfill. It should exert a unifying social influence. It should set an example of religious toleration, and cultivate mutual respect between diverse churches. A university which draws its students from a large area has also a unifying influence in regard to political discussions and divisions. A true university is a school of public spirit for its governors, benefactors, officers, graduates, and students. Again, it stands for intellectual and spiritual forces against materialism and luxury. It should always be a school of good manners, and of independent thinking. Finally, universities should be always patriotic in the best sense...

During twenty-five years while resistance challenged him at almost every turn, Eliot had accustomed himself to think of it as a stimulus. To find, suddenly, that the majority was with him, that the audiences he faced were initially friendly instead of hostile when he rose to speak, was disconcerting for a while. He said it made him "un-

comfortable." A sense of discomfort does not last long in a cordial atmosphere, however, and soon it seemed to be noticeable that the man was expanding responsively. He became less reserved, more forth-going, more conversable, more ready to betray his wistful desire to come nearer to people. The manifestations of his good will toward his fellows seemed, in the glow of the hour and ever after, to bud more readily and to open more copiously. This warmth excited more warmth again. The undergraduates, who are both sensitive and responsive, were affected by the change. It became easy, instead of difficult, to raise a cheer for him. Cordiality began to enter into their feeling for the President of whom they had known for some time that they ought to be proud.

No pledges of adhesion, loyalty, or admiration pleased him so much as any phrase that seemed to imply a feeling of affection. Admiration, agreement, loyalty were the chief burden of the chorus of applause which sounded around him at the time of the twenty-fifth anniversary. A sad event that happened three years later called forth pure sympathy.

In 1897 his eldest son, Charles, contracted cerebrospinal meningitis and died within a few days. The shock of this blow which fell without warning was almost prostrating to Eliot. It has already been explained that his relation to Charles was closer and happier than that which ordinarily subsists between grown-up sons and the most devoted parents. He had been watching Charles's rapid advance in the new profession of landscape archi-

ture with a pride that was as reasonable as it was natural, and the kind of public service that Charles rendered when he established the Board of Trustees of Public Reservations, for instance, and when, again, he helped to organize and to plan the new Metropolitan Park System of Boston, commanded from him a respect which might justly be called reverent. In spite of his reserve, and in spite of the fact that he applied himself, as always when in pain and affliction, to hard work without intermission, it was apparent that Charles's death submerged him in grief. People who were about him and others who were at a distance expressed their sympathy, and although sympathy does not compensate for a loss, the ways in which it was now given to him from all sides, sometimes gracefully, often awkwardly and dumbly, made another profound impression. He learned that people from whom he had never counted upon friendship or expected love harbored for him a fellow-feeling in which an emotional element was unmistakable. "He became softer, and kinder, and nearer after that." The remark has been made so often that it is entitled to respectful admission to this record.

Two letters, written to acknowledge letters of condolence, follow.

To Dr. George A. Gordon

April 5, 1897.

... We know, however, that his short life was singularly beautiful, serviceable, and happy. His own family life was

simply a bit of heaven on earth, delightful to live, and delightful to witness. To account for such good, except on the theory of the moral government of the universe, would be vastly more difficult than to solve the problem of evil. In such straits as we are now in, there is only one holding-ground — the fundamental proposition of your Ingersoll Lecture [on Human Immortality].

In the last six years of his life Charles accomplished, without public observation, a great amount of work in his profession, most of which will contribute to the health and happiness of the people in and about Boston. Complete sympathy between him and me in this work was a great happiness for both of us.

He leaves four little daughters, all healthy and charming, and they will make their mother wish to live.

With all thanks and good wishes, Sincerely yours,...

To D. C. Gilman

BROOKLINE, April 23, 1897

MY DEAR GILMAN, — Your words of sympathy when Charles died were welcome to us all. Mrs. Eliot and I have stayed here ever since with our daughter and her little children, for leaving her alone in this pleasant house where she and Charles had been so happy was not to be thought of. No death which has occurred in my family or in the circle of my intimate friends, since I was old enough to know what death is, has seemed to me such a heavy loss and calamity as this one.

I am examining his letters and papers, and I am filled

with wonder at what he accomplished in the ten years of his professional life. His family life was a beautiful spectacle for men and angels. And all these sources of happiness and good service ceasing at thirty-seven! For those who were near him this ceasing is an irreparable loss and a life-long sorrow.

We have had great satisfaction in the testimony of many people of all sorts to Charles' influence and serviceableness. In the natural course of events I should have died without ever having appreciated his influence. His death has shown it to me.

Already we are planning for Mt. Desert, where we hope to have this family with us in August and September. We are all well, though our hearts are heavy. With affectionate remembrance to Mrs. Gilman, I am, Sincerely yours,...

Thus, if it be desirable to assign dates, it would seem fair to say that it was between the years 1890 and 1897 that Eliot arrived at a truly cordial personal relationship with his associates at Harvard.

The larger academic world and the general public adopted him more slowly than did Cambridge. But only a little slower. One might express what happened by saying that he became successively a man of influence, a leader in good works, a public figure, an eminent personage, and finally "the first private citizen of the country." If it is not fanciful to use such a scale of graduation it

would also seem just to say that he had become a leader in good works and a public figure by the early nineties, held the position of an eminent personage before the end of that decade, and was generally looked up to and widely admired when the new century opened. There is unmistakable proof of this in Appendix G, where the public honors that were conferred upon him are listed in their chronological sequence. There it may be seen that three colleges voted honorary degrees to him while he was standing at the threshold of his career and when their compliments were manifestly paid to Harvard rather than to him; but that no similar honor was paid to him between 1870 and 1902. Thereafter such tokens of respect became frequent.

To understand rightly how Eliot came to be accepted as a leader of public opinion it is necessary to remind ourselves how extensively he had been concerning himself with matters that lay outside his Harvard bailiwick. He had said in his Inaugural Address that a president of the University must keep watch of the progress of the age, and the gradual alteration of social and religious habits in the community; that he must try to profit by every real discussion of education, legislation, and sociology. This sensible observation had expressed his own inclination, and the daily routine of university administration had not prevented him from obeying it. While he worked over Harvard's reconstruction he diligently observed the conditions of American society and ruminated upon them.¹

¹ Prof. W. B. Munro, of the Dept. of Government, says that very soon after

When he arrived at a conviction, he expressed it; frequently, as we have seen, what he said ran ahead of the public's readiness to agree. But little by little it became apparent that his ideas were cohesive and that they rested upon a social philosophy that was easy to understand. It was one that commended itself to some of the deepest preferences of the American heart.

Perhaps the simplest way to remind ourselves of this is to glance at the papers and addresses that Eliot republished in 1897 in a volume entitled "American Contributions to Civilization." A group of five of these titles suffices to bring out one aspect of his social philosophy:

"The Forgotten Millions" (1890).

"Family Stocks in a Democracy" (1890).

"The Present Disadvantages of Rich Men" (1893).

"The Happy Life" (1895).

"Equality in a Republic" (1896).

These five essays all centered upon one theme — the soundness and essential rightness of the democratic order. They looked to the well-being of the multitude, and dwelt on sources of happiness upon which anyone may draw. They exhibited his belief that merit should be free to assert itself, and that in a democracy it can and does trans-

Galveston began the initial American experiment in city government by commission Eliot stopped him in the Yard and asked what he knew about it. Professor Munro said in effect — "Very little; but I don't think the device will succeed and be imitated." Eliot replied that the Galveston experiment looked promising to him; that he ventured to think it would be copied elsewhere; and that he believed it would repay careful study. — It would be easy to multiply incidents to show, as did this, how large was the social landscape of which he was observant.

mit its precious and useful heritage from generation to generation. They showed how highly Eliot rated the satisfactions and the worth of lives of adventure and decision whether, impartially, their action proceeds on a mighty or a modest stage. It seems logical that this series of papers should have begun with the one entitled "Forgotten Millions," for that essay opened with the thesis that an antidote for a pessimistic state of mind about modern civilization may be found in "careful study of the communities which illustrate the commonest social conditions and the commonest modes of life," and went on, by way of proof, to draw a picture of the financial, economic, political, social and æsthetic qualities of the simple communities of Mount Desert Island. The series would seem to end most appropriately with a paper written in 1899, too late for inclusion in the "American Contributions to Civilization," which was called "John Gilley, Maine Farmer and Fisherman." This little thirty-page homily was the story of one of "the forgotten millions," a man who lived his span of years on a small island lying off the shore of Mount Desert, and whom Eliot had known well. Nobody, except his neighbors, need ever have heard of John Gilley, but Eliot's paper enjoyed a wide circulation because it made Gilley real, and symbolic of much that America holds precious. Because of their balance, shrewd observation, moral insight, brevity, serenity and simple nobility of style these essays all deserved to be recognized as belonging to the true classic order. They were in fact little works of art. Eliot thought that "John Gilley"

was one of three papers which, among all he wrote, might prove to have an enduring interest for posterity. It possesses many of the qualities that insure against oblivion.

Glance also at another group of five titles from the same volume:

“The Working of the American Democracy” (1888).

“One Remedy for Municipal Government” (1891).

“Some Reasons Why the American Republic may Endure” (1894).

“Five American Contributions to Civilization” (1896).

“International Arbitration” (1896).

And then turn to the titles of some of the eighteen essays or addresses that were gathered up in the volume called “Educational Reform” in 1898:

“What is a Liberal Education” (1884).

“Liberty in Education” (1885).

“Can School Programs be Shortened and Enriched?” (1888).

“Undesirable and Desirable Uniformity in Schools” (1892).

“The Function of Education in Democratic Society” (1897).

By the latter nineties, it was impossible to think of Eliot as just a college president, a bookish, professorial creature moving about inside a sphere of academic interests. He might talk often about the technical problems of education, such things being admittedly his special business; but it was clear that he cared and thought in a large way about the welfare of the next American generations and

that he did not conceive of that future in terms of dollars, or trade, but in terms of character, and opportunity for the exercise of courage, talent and taste. Seeking always to see how to lay solid foundations for enduring happiness, he was constantly recurring to the necessity of developing in youth the faculty of exercising judgment, of observing accurately before beginning to reason, of recording correctly, of comparing, grouping, and inferring justly and of expressing cogently the results that are called decisions or conclusions. All this was before we had begun to hear about "motivation" and "behaviorism," but it was plain that Eliot was not overawed by the dignity of the part that Reason plays in our lives. The art of reasoning is of little use until powers of observation and discrimination have been developed. He kept telling people to cultivate the art of enjoying the physical world through every one of their five senses. And, above all, he expected them to find abiding happiness in a generous exercise of their social instincts and the cultivation of a reverent spirit.

By this time Eliot had acquired the reputation of having a gift for the writing of inscriptions. The fact is worthy of notice in this connection because style is only a small part of what is required for the composing of an inscription. Innumerable penny-a-liners command the requisite verbal dexterity. But one would not trust them to discern correctly in the person or deed to be commemorated the noble and deathless elements that an inscription must preserve; nor could one trust them to strip from

those elements the toggerly in which prejudice, convention, and sentimentality would wrap them and consign them again to obscurity. The writer of many good inscriptions must have discernment and wisdom of an Olympian order.

If it were to be asked how it came to be known that Eliot could compose admirable inscriptions, the answer would be that when he conferred honorary degrees at Commencement time, he composed what were very like little inscriptions for all the men to whom he gave degrees, and that these lapidary phrases were very felicitous.¹ When one assembles a considerable series of these expressions their characteristics become apparent. They convince one that Eliot sought to express his idea of the estimable quality of the man who was being honored with scrupulous justice. This rigorous quality made them seem significant as well as sincere. Consider, as examples, the phrases in which degrees were conferred upon the ambassadors from three foreign countries. The degrees were delivered in different years, but the phrases ought to be placed side by side.

“Julian Pauncefote: First Baron Pauncefote of Preston, English ambassador, welcome representative of the country from which America has derived its best stock, its most serviceable habits of thought, and its ideals of public liberty and public justice.” (1900)

“Theodore von Holleben: Ambassador of the young and lusty German Empire, representative of an ancient people whose racial and institutional roots are intertwined with our own, — of a people

¹ Until 1896 the degrees were awarded in Latin and a translation was published after the Commencement ceremony.

whose scholars and universities have for a century given example and inspiration to the learned world." (1901)

"Jean Jules Jusserand: Professional republican diplomat from youth, eminent man of letters who chose his subjects from English social and literary history, Ambassador of France at Washington, to whom and through whom the American people would gladly express their obligation to the genius of the French people, under monarchy, empire, and republic alike." (1907)

Consider, too, the care with which he assigned the reasons for complimenting four Americans concerning whose public careers he had definite views of his own.

"Theodore Roosevelt: President of the United States, from his youth a member of this society of scholars, now in his prime a true type of the sturdy gentleman, and the high-minded public servant in a democracy." (1902)

"Henry Cabot Lodge: Essayist, biographer, jurist, member in Congress at thirty-seven, now already Senator from Massachusetts for eleven years, with long vistas of generous service still inviting him." (1904)

(Eliot would not have proposed the degree for Lodge; other members of the Governing Boards voted it through. The last words were an unmistakable hint to "do better in the future.")

"William Howard Taft: Teacher of law, judge, president of the Philippine Commission, and Secretary of War, and in all these great functions clear-sighted, robust, disinterested, just, and patriotic." (1905)

"Elihu Root: Lawyer, jurist, statesman, Secretary of War for four years and a half, now for two years Secretary of State, a diplomatist who represents not a dynasty, or a cabinet, but a people, an envoy of good faith and good will among the nations." (1907)

If there was only one thing to say about a man, which was sometimes the case, Eliot did not overstate it.

"John Codman Ropes: Biographer of Napoleon, Chronicler of Waterloo, competent military historian and critic." (1897)

But when he said "competent," the audience was suddenly certain that there are very few really competent historians, and that one of them was Ropes.

At any rate, Eliot began to be called upon to write inscriptions in the seventies, and had written a number before Daniel Burnham enlisted him to fill the panels on the Water Gate for the World's Fair of 1893 in Chicago. These inscriptions are reproduced in Appendix E. But before the reader turns to examine them let him consider what a complicated problem the composition of an inscription presents. There are physical difficulties of the picture-puzzle order. The space available to the writer has often been prescribed to an inch by the architect's design of the monument. Within that space the letters must be of a legible size, and so the number of words is approximately determined beforehand. Furthermore, the words may have to be susceptible of being spaced to form a composition of longer and shorter lines. Passing beyond these rigorous formal limitations, the subject may call for study, perhaps for investigation before the significance of the monument can be justly apprehended by the writer. When Eliot was asked to compose an inscription for the Sanders house in Salem where Alexander Bell invented the telephone it was necessary for him to

learn not only the history of the invention but the story of Bell's relation to the house and to the Sanders family. During leisure hours he worked the subject up very thoroughly. Then it developed that Bell, who was alive, was inclined to be critical and fastidious. He had to be placated, and before the inscription was finished Eliot had worked at it intermittently during five years.

The commonest faults in historical inscriptions are — exaggeration, a straining after sentiment, and the failure to find and fix upon an element of everlasting significance. Eliot's theory was that an inscription must confine itself carefully to an expression that will be likely to make the same appeal to the human mind or heart a hundred years hence that it does to-day, so that it may carry to a remote posterity a message that will interest, or give pleasure, or excite emotion. As examples of his application of this theory the reader will find, in Appendix E, an inscription that he wrote for the monument to Colonel Robert Gould Shaw of the first Negro regiment that fought in the Civil War, and another that he composed for the Evacuation Monument in Boston.¹

Mention of inscriptions has led to a digression, though not an irrelevant one, from the main subject of present interest, — the character, namely, which a wide public

¹ The Committee which erected the Shaw Monument wanted to improve Eliot's inscription by substituting the word "negro" for the word "despised" in the third line, and by changing the word "black" to "colored" at the beginning of the second paragraph. Fortunately, Eliot did not yield to their preference.

had learned to ascribe to Eliot. What is still to be mentioned in that connection should, perhaps, be thought of as combining and outweighing everything else. When a man is named to us — certainly this is true of our contemporaries — we do not think of something like a bodiless principle of authorship; on the contrary, we remember or imagine a personality incarnated in a physical presence, visible and audible, and, according to its own fashion and its own degree, more or less impressive. Now Eliot was so fortunate as to stamp a sharp impression of his presence upon his contemporaries.

It was that of a man who, figuratively speaking, spoke always from the same platform with a tone and with a manner peculiar to himself and unforgettable. His physical aspect had become familiar. People who saw him in the flesh did not forget his strong, heavily scarred physiognomy and his commanding figure. For the greater public which knew him by report and picture, the view of his left profile which was invariably presented established a retinal image almost as constant as the left profile of George Washington on the two-cent stamp. His voice, which Professor C. T. Copeland once described as sounding as if it issued from channels that had been warmed with old port wine, conveyed more feeling than his outer man betrayed and could be pitched and adapted to any room or audience so perfectly that whether in a small conference or in a large hall Eliot's auditors had the feeling that they were being addressed as directly as if in conversation. This brought him near to them. His

method of argument was in harmony with his manner of address. The absence of gesture and oratorical devices of any sort suited an exposition of facts, and Eliot did not reason ingeniously, trying to drive people into corners by logic. Power to convey the idea of a conviction strongly held is more effective against the stolid ramparts of human prejudice than an impeccable syllogism. What he said usually seemed to be an understatement just when it was most masterly as a heaping up of factual cogencies, and it often suggested, as though unwillingly, that strong feeling was being strongly repressed.

Indeed, the effect of Eliot's physical presence was a large element in the total phenomenon of his relation to other people, especially during his latter years. This is a point that it is very difficult to do justice to. The best way to understand it, if one never knew him, would be to think of some one else — a Macgregor who is at the head of the table wherever he sits down; a person who, when he joins a company, sensibly changes the atmosphere of the room and the course of everybody else's conversation, whose voice and glance seem to have the power of commanding the attention of one or two people or of everybody present, according to his unspoken will. When such a man steps upon a public platform the audience begins to listen before he begins to speak. We all know men who communicate a sense of conviction and impart enthusiasm to their hearers in courts and assemblies by virtue of some mysterious way in which their physical presences count, but concerning whom we have

discovered that a reading of their words has no comparable effect upon people who have not felt the impact of their personalities. Emerson said of Channing, "He could never be reported, and his eye and voice could not be printed, and his discourses lost their best in losing them." George Washington, such a towering pillar of strength to his own contemporaries, so enigmatically uninspiring to posterity, must have owed part of his living influence to such mortal powers. We try to indicate the occasional potent manifestation of the influence of the individual by using such words as force, power, impressiveness. But they are dull and inadequate. Such men induce that slight paralysis of judgment in others which, as Mr. J. J. Chapman says, is part of what goes to the making of a hero, and is, as he adds, a joyful sensation.

Eliot was not conscious of what other people called his courage, but others, when they listened to him, felt more courage themselves. He made it seem natural to dismiss short views and to have faith. The whole impulse of his nature proceeded unhesitatingly to action, and other people's misgivings and hesitations were temporarily allayed in his presence. He had strength to spare, was not impatient, seemed to be so confident of the ultimate outcome that he was not concerned to reckon time. His serenity was therefore august, and encouraged one to make great demands of the future as of right.

In order that it may not seem to readers who never saw Eliot that these are the imaginings of an uncritical admirer, let me summon evidence. Note the expressions that other people used about him:

He began to speak, and one said to oneself, "This must be the voice of a great man."¹

"This great and formidable being.... It seems to me, and I still think, that I never knew a greater man."²

"Everything about Eliot was vital. His wonderful low voice, his benignant smile, a smile that was assured, well poised and habitual, could not be forgotten. To talk with him was to be played upon by a fountain of genial force. ... As for the general impression you had in your mind, when you thought of Eliot's position in the world of Boston; — a little nimbus of glory always seemed to enclose him. He was the victim of a general apotheosis. He was really a king of men in his generation."³

"I listened once to a speech by Lincoln, sitting near enough to touch him with a trout rod; but it is not a more vivid memory than I still have of the debate between Eliot and Wendell Phillips on the issue of admitting women to Harvard. Phillips was never at his best unless emotionally stirred, as he was on that occasion, and when he closed I think the odds would have been twenty to one that he could not be adequately answered. But I left that hall feeling that my idol, Wendell Phillips, had lost every single point, and I am sure that my impression was shared by the audience generally, except, of course, by the ardent suffrage group. Eliot's superb restraint, no gestures or emotional appeal, seemed to present just a clearly

¹ Davis, Allen, in *The Public Speaking Review* for October, 1911.

² Briggs, L. B. R., "As Seen by a Disciple"; in *Atlantic Monthly*, Nov., 1929.

³ Chapman, J. J., "President Eliot," in *Memories and Milestones*, 185.

reasoned statement of the pertinent facts. Then and there began for me a sort of fascinated interest in the man which has never grown less.”¹

Or try to imagine him at the Centennial exercises at Phillips Exeter Academy, speaking after Governor Ben Butler. The occasion was to be followed six days later, as everybody knew, by a Harvard Commencement at which Butler was to appear and where he was probably *not* going to receive the complimentary Doctor of Laws degree which Harvard had given to every preceding governor of Massachusetts. Butler was likewise a man whose presence could fill a court room and make itself felt in any company. He was a vindictive fighter, and it was to be supposed that Eliot, knowing that Harvard was to slight him publicly within a week, would try to avoid an encounter. But after Butler had delivered a eulogy of the machine era to the Exeter gathering and had told his hearers that they would surely rather have built the Brooklyn Bridge than have been the greatest poets of any time, Eliot stood up and asked:

“What drives the steam engine? Not the engineer, but the life-giving sun which elaborated centuries ago the coal that is put under the boilers. What is it that you must learn here which will always be above all literature and all science, powerful though science may become? You must learn the eternal worth of character; you must learn that the ultimate powers of the human race lie in its undying instincts and passions: you must learn that

¹ Statement by Mr. John Graham Brooks.

above all material things, is man — the thoughtful, passionate and emotional being, the intellectual, and religious man. Here lies the source of the power of educated men — they have refined and strengthened their minds and their souls. And, believe me, the supreme powers of this universe are not mechanical or material; they are hope and fear and love.”¹ — The impression created was overwhelming.

Or the reader may imagine himself present at the Alumni Dinner on Commencement Day, 1898 — the summer of the Spanish War. Mr. Charles Francis Adams, as President of the Alumni, said that the cost of the war, estimated at \$40,000,000 a month, would run 365 universities like Harvard, and he would be pleased if President Eliot would enlarge upon that topic. “I am not sure” — responded Eliot — “that I shall be able to follow President Adams in the line of thought he has suggested. The quick capital of Harvard University is, indeed, not more than the cost of two battleships; but can we compute what those battleships may win? It was Charles Sumner — he is looking down on us from the other side of this hall — who first made comparisons of this nature, and brought out in 1845 the argument just used by President Adams; but sixteen years afterward there came upon us that terrific struggle for the country’s life which President Adams has been so eloquently describing. In 1861, I

¹ From President Eliot’s address at the *Exercises at the Centennial Celebration of the Founding of Phillips Exeter Academy*, June 20 and 21, 1883 (Exeter, N.H., 1884), pp. 64–65.

for one came to the conclusion that Charles Sumner's argument was a vicious one. I have been talking much with our students during the last ten weeks about their going to this war. In 1861, when I was an assistant professor here, I talked with a great many friends and comrades who went to the civil war; and I want to testify that, although the two wars in their origin and motive can hardly be compared, the spirit which animates the youth in Harvard University is now just what it was then. The educated youth who loves his country does not stop to consider in what precise cause his country has gone to war. If he did, he could not find out. When we look back on the earlier wars in which our country has been engaged, do we not clearly see that the men who entered upon each of those wars had no conception of the end to which the war was to lead them? That is true, I think, of every one of our wars. It certainly was true of the Revolutionary war and of the war of the Rebellion. The ends actually accomplished by the Mexican war were almost the opposite of those its promoters sought. Certainly in the present case, when the grave problem was presented to the youth of the University — 'Shall we enlist in the service of the country?' — not a man, old or young, knew into what difficulties and dangers this war was immediately to lead our people. Our youth have gone to the war for the simplest kind of reasons. Some said, 'The government wants two hundred thousand men. I am a man, and I am free to go; I will go.' That has been a common frame of mind. Others went from mixed

motives — a general sense of duty; the love of adventure; the hope to see new things, and to feel new sensations; the desire to test one's self under new hardships and dangers; the curiosity to see whether one can calmly face imminent death. And others have offered their services and their lives to the country without much thought — just for love, as a lover throws a rose at the feet of his mistress. Yet, though battleships may sometimes — at a rare moment — do more for civilization than universities, universities must go steadily on through peace and through war. Harvard University has been through all the wars that have been fought by our people on this continent, and has had an honorable part in them all. And some of them have come very near her — right by her gates. I doubt if there is anybody alive who can give much instruction to Harvard University concerning true patriotism.”¹ Men who were present in Memorial Hall that afternoon have remembered this as the most impressive speech they ever heard. Something more than the appropriate and admirable words went to the making of such an impression.

At the risk of personal comparisons, think of the stage of Sanders Theater on Commencement Day, with a semi-circle of academic dignitaries and guests of the University — some in brilliant gowns, some in uniforms — surrounding a little clear space into which the recipient of an honorary degree steps for the audience to gaze at him while the President addresses him for a moment. A

¹ *Harv. Grad. Mag.*, VII, 52-53 (1898).

long procession of men of every aspect, shy scholars and public personages of commanding appearance, replaced each other in that space during the forty years of Eliot's presidency. Cleveland, Roosevelt, Taft recur immediately to one's memory as men of imposing or dynamic presence; but when Eliot addressed them it was he who seemed to dominate the scene.

Finally, consider two bits of testimony that Mr. Rollo Walter Brown has quoted. Perhaps they illuminate the quality that we have been trying to make seem real better than can descriptions of the impression Eliot made on public occasions.

"... Merely a glimpse of him as he walked erect and at peace with his own spirit was enough to reveal an extraordinary man. It was worth all the money I ever spent in Cambridge just to see President Eliot come from the little red-brick house on Quincy Street, glance about in the morning sunshine with the admiring reverence of a child, walk to University Hall, respond with amused but benevolent dignity to the salutation of the negro boy who gathered cigarette stubs, and then, very erect, mount the steps and disappear in the building....

"'I was a sophomore,' a man said twenty years after college, 'and I had a sophomore's notions of what constituted fitness. I would not have been seen crossing Harvard Square with a package of groceries in my arm for any sum of money. In the course of the long vacation I chanced to be in Cambridge. The day was sweltering. Just before lunch time I passed the large grocery store

formerly in the Square. I heard a familiar voice and looked up. President Eliot was coming from the door with an enormous watermelon under his arm. He moved off in the direction of Quincy Street. At a distance, I followed. Halfway home he put the melon down against the roots of an elm, took out his handkerchief, and mopped his brow and cheeks. But he did not rest long. Evidently somebody wanted that particular melon for lunch. So he lifted it to his arms again and moved on toward the house. Nothing that Harvard College ever did for me was worth half so much as that five minutes of President Eliot's life. For he knocked out of me all the nonsense there was in me — and there was a great deal!''¹

Thus, adds Mr. Brown, men were beginning to use Eliot as a justification for reasonable conduct in their own daily life.

¹ Brown, Rollo Walter, *Lonely Americans*, 37-39. The first part of the quotation has been cast into the first person singular with Mr. Brown's permission.

CHAPTER XIV

Letters written between 1897 and 1909 on various subjects — The three-year degree question again — Visit of Prince Henry — The report of the Committee on Instruction in the College — Capital and Labor and the Faneuil Hall meeting — The Negro question in the South — Resignation from the presidency.

DR. H. P. WALCOTT has reported a conversation that furnishes food for reflection. It occurred at a meeting of a men's dining club, and presumably during the nineties. The company was talking about the filling of offices in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, when Eliot unexpectedly announced that there was one office he would like to hold himself. It turned out to be none other than the Postmaster Generalship. "That," remarked Dunbar after the dinner, "was just like Eliot. The Postmaster Generalship calls for administrative work that is difficult and full of detail; it is important; it is usually badly done. Eliot would enjoy tackling it." Dunbar was right, but one may surmise that the office offered other attractions as well. The postal service is not unconnected with education. It has usually been the great instrument of political patronage; and Eliot was a civil service reformer. Perhaps it would have been impossible, during that decade or the next, for a man of his principles to accomplish a great deal, even with a president's resolute backing. But it is fascinating to think what would have happened if he had been made Postmaster General under say Cleveland, or Roosevelt. His energies and

powers would have been directed to radical reforms. The conflict with the patronage mongers might have been a gorgeous one to watch. No matter how it ended it would have touched issues that are full of political significance.

The conversation also suggests another question; whether, namely, the time had come when, his chief contribution to Harvard University having been made, Eliot might not have rendered a greater service to his generation by turning to some new sphere of public endeavor. In this uncompromising form the question cannot be answered and may be dismissed. And yet if it be put so that it does not threaten the complete elimination of Harvard University from Eliot's later career, it is not entirely speculative after all, and it appears that the facts have supplied something like an answer. From the nineties onward — it would be absurd to strain for a precise date — he did give to other than Harvard affairs an ever greater share of his attention.

Indeed, Eliot's center of gravity now appears to be moving off its Harvard base, and coming to rest above broader foundations.

The biographer accordingly finds himself carrying the story into a new phase. Harvard will still be mentioned frequently, but Eliot as an object of scrutiny must appear more and more self-sustaining and as detachable from its affairs. The rapid march into unexplored country — for that was the essence of the first twenty-five years of his Harvard presidency — no longer imposes on us the sense of its movement. The figure we have been watching has

attained a position on an eminence; there it becomes stationary; and, at the same time, its stature seems to grow and it becomes more commanding.

Coincidentally, biographical material that is suitable for the delineation of an august personage standing upon an eminence offers itself. The principal documents for the years since 1869 have been Annual Reports, votes of governing boards, essays and reports of speeches. From the later nineties onward file copies of dictated letters multiply rapidly, and more anecdotes and impressions are recorded by other people. A larger use will therefore be made of disconnected incidents and letters that touch a variety of themes. Readers will understand that quotations from letters, of which this book will henceforward be largely composed, are not selected because they redound to his honor, or show him to have been mistaken, or tend to establish a conclusion as to some debated question, but simply because they are illustrative.

There will be no objection to going back to the year 1897 for the first selection. It was written three months after Charles Eliot's death to his eldest daughter, aged seven years.

To his Granddaughter

June 19, 1897

DEAR RUTH, — Yesterday Grandmother and I rode on our bicycles by your school route to the Arboretum and back between six and seven-fifty o'clk in the morning. It was a beautiful summer day, bright and warm with a

little north-west wind. Today we have ridden round Fresh Pond in the still, fair morning. Isn't it delightful that we have such pleasant places to go to, where we can see trees and grass and shrubs and dark blue water and pale blue sky, and hear the birds sing? Are not you glad that we do not have to live in city streets, where houses and pavements cover all the ground.

Sunday, June 20th. Yesterday afternoon at quarter before five Grandmother and I started with Toby in the buggy and our supper in a basket for Revere Beach. We found a pleasanter road than any we have tried before and got there in an hour and a quarter. A great deal of work is going on, but the beach will not be in good order for the public this summer. We drove the whole length of the beach, and eat our supper at the northern end. The sea was quiet and the air balmy. Then we drove home the same way we came, meeting many bicycles. Frances and Dorothea Foote were sitting on the piazza with Harry [Foote] when we arrived at 8.30. They will stay till after Commencement. Please hand the enclosed bill to Mamma. It rained hard here this morning, but perhaps we shall get a drive this afternoon. Peggy is all right. Her lameness was in her foot as Dan said. Your loving

GRANDFATHER

To Mrs. H. H. Bancroft

Jan. 17, 1898

DEAR MADAM, — The story of Robin Hood illustrates perfectly what I mean by saying that most of our reading

for children has a vicious tendency. It presents to the childish mind a vulgar cattle thief and highway robber as a person of admirable qualities who lives a life of intense interest and many delights. I remember thinking when I was a boy that Robin Hood was a fine fellow on the whole, though a minority of his qualities were bad.

But though I think I see the mischief which is done to each new generation by the literature ordinarily set before it, I must confess that I am not prepared to prescribe the remedy. To write good books for children will require at least as much genius as it has required to produce the perverting myths, fairy stories, biographies and jingling verses with which our children are now supplied.

I am inclined to think that when children are of an age to learn about evil and wrong doing they should be made acquainted with real evils and sins rather than with imaginary. When we look back on beliefs of past generations from the vantage ground of modern science do we not see clearly that the happiness of the human race has been seriously diminished by belief in purely imaginary evils like imps, demons, the evil eye, hell fire, and the undying worm? The human imagination, and particularly the imagination of the greatest geniuses, has been chiefly exercised on evils and horrors of all kinds. Our children have to learn about evils enough at the best, and they ought to be relieved just as far as possible from imaginary evils. Very truly yours,...

Part of a letter of Dicey's may be interjected for the pleasant glimpse it gives of the Eliot household.

A. V. Dicey to Mrs. Dicey

Oct. 19, 1898

... We are all preparing to leave this afternoon. It is to me rather sad, for I feel so at home and happy with the Eliots.... I feel I have not at all properly conveyed the pleasant sense I had of an open, easy, occupied life. One thing... was the strong sense you had of the family life. Eliot was always having his grandchildren, nephews, nieces, and the like about him. He talked to me so naturally about his son whom he has lost. He was always giving one anecdotes of his little granddaughters, and Mrs. Eliot told me that one of the joys of their life was the affection and sympathy existing between Eliot and the widow of his lost son.¹

The courtesies of the competition in which colleges engage to secure professors have not always been observed as pleasantly as they were between Eliot and Gilman.

To D. C. Gilman

Feb. 6, 1899

MY DEAR GILMAN, — I am writing by this mail to Professor Minton Warren to offer him a Latin Professorship at Harvard with a first salary of \$4000 a year. I give you the earliest possible information of this action on my part, in order that you may have every opportunity to do whatever the interests of Johns Hopkins seem to you to require under these circumstances. Our Corporation invites Professor Warren because he seems to them to be the most desirable American to add to our staff in this

¹ Rait, R. S., *Memorials of Albert Venn Dicey* (London, 1925), 152-53.

Department. I do not know whether or not, in the present situation of Johns Hopkins University, you would desire to retain Professor Warren's services, he being offered a good place elsewhere. At various times during the last twenty-five years I know that I have been glad to replace a Professor by an Assistant Professor for the sake of economy. At any rate, you can see in this action of the Corporation a compliment to your good judgment in selecting Professor Warren for your staff many years ago....

To Mr. Samuel L. Parrish

Nov. 17, 1899

I have read the newspaper cutting from the Tribune of November 3rd, which you were so good as to send me. I agree with you, first, that we cannot leave the Philippines; secondly, that we cannot expect the Filipinos to set up a republican government; and thirdly, that we cannot bring the present fighting to an end leaving the Filipinos with the impression that we are afraid of them. That is as far as my agreement with you goes.

I consider all the talk that has been indulged in for a year by our people, high and low, about unconditional surrender, submission, and subjugation, absolutely wrong and extraordinarily foolish. That sort of talk is just what we should never have suffered to escape from our lips. President McKinley began it, and still sticks to it; and history will write him down a narrow-minded and commonplace man because of it.

There are plenty of examples before us of the wise way for a civilized nation to deal with a barbarous people. The whole English colonial policy of the last forty years preaches just one lesson, and preaches it very loudly, — “Let the barbarous governments stand, and deal with them just as much as you can; use force as seldom as possible, and to the least extent possible; protect, and advise the barbarous governments, and insist steadily on practical and not too sudden reforms in administration.” As an instance of the marvelous results of this policy look at the Straits Settlements where a population closely resembling that of the Philippine Islands, but more numerous, has been kept at peace and helped forward in civilization by a few English officials supported only by a few blue-jackets. It is not only the civil policy adopted by President McKinley which I should complain of, if it were any of my business, — the military policy of the last year has been as bad. I do not know how a worse policy could be imagined than the spasmodic occupation of territory by armed forces which almost immediately abandon it. There are plenty of English examples which illustrate this vicious policy, notably of England in the Soudan in the eighties; but England has learned better, and now holds fast all she takes.

I say none of these things in public, for the reason that it does not seem to me expedient to weaken the authority of the men who most unfortunately have control of our affairs in the East. We must support the measures they propose, although they are manifestly ignorant and stupid

measures. The fundamental trouble is that there are no means of changing our administration, or of changing the minds of the present administration. Sir Andrew Clark, the wonderfully successful administrator of the Straits Settlements for two years, was in Washington lately; but nobody there cared to hear what he had to say. Sir Andrew told me this himself, or I should have found it incredible. It is the old story over again, just as Benjamin Franklin put it, — "Experience keeps a dear school; but fools can learn in no other, and scarce in that." Very truly yours,...

It should perhaps be noted in this connection that Eliot, in spite of his individualism and his strong belief in the wisdom of letting people learn by the experience of standing on their own feet, did not take an extreme "liberal" view of the duty of conquering nations toward backward peoples. Perhaps this theoretical inconsistency arose in some measure from his instinctive respect for efficient administration. Thus he had a poor opinion of Gladstone's conduct of African and Egyptian affairs, and thus he expressed himself to Bryce in a letter written from Egypt in 1895 (March 30) as advocating a public announcement of the English intention to remain in Egypt. "The achievements of a few Englishmen and Scotchmen in Egyptian finance, irrigation, and courts of justice within fourteen years are marvellous, particularly in view of the active opposition of France, and the lack of support in England. Their difficulties have been increased enor-

mously by the fact that England has never said squarely — we are going to stay in Egypt. Moreover the situation of the young educated Egyptians — no matter of which race or which religion — is made very trying by the same uncertainty about the permanence of the English control. They have their careers to make. Shall they stake their all on the continuance of English influence? It is a terrible question for hundreds of the rising generation. What wonder if many try to curry favor with both sides! I sympathize most heartily with these educated Egyptians who have come to manhood during the British occupation.... An established civilized government in Egypt would be a great help in the inevitable process of getting rid of the ineffable Turk.”

To Mrs. J. Elliot Cabot

Jan. 30, 1900

... As to compromising, it seems to me that it never pays to compromise about a principle of right and wrong; but that it does pay to compromise on measures like laws or regulations, provided the measure goes your way though not as far as you would like. I have had to work in that way for thirty years in Harvard College. Keeping a principle always in view and never yielding it I have had to advance toward that ideal by short steps when I would have preferred long ones. Affectionately yours,...

Among the associates with whom Eliot worked between 1870 and 1900, and of the friends he made in middle life,

Charles F. Dunbar was probably the man for whom he felt the warmest attachment. Dunbar, the reader will recall, had been Dean of the College from 1876 to 1882. He used to go cruising on the "Sunshine" during the summers before Eliot's second marriage, and when Eliot built his house at Northeast Harbor, Dunbar established his summer home on Bear Island less than half a mile away. His death removed not only a counsellor but a neighbor and holiday companion.

To Mrs. William James

Feb. 6, 1900

...The death of Professor Dunbar is a serious loss to the University, and a great personal loss to both Mrs. Eliot and me. I was sure of his quality in 1869, and as soon as I became President urged him to take a professorship. He was then much out of health, and it was two years before he came to Cambridge. Ever since 1871 he has been a priceless adviser and friend. Of his four children only his son William seems likely to remain in Cambridge, and the two houses to which he was greatly attached will probably pass into the hands of strangers. It seems to be one of the consequences of American city or suburb existence that families have no permanent home generation after generation. That has not been in the past the right way to build durable families.... He was just like a brother to me all through the past twenty-eight years, and I shall miss very much his counsel and his silent, but intense, affection....



THEODORE LYMAN, 1864



CHARLES F. DUNBAR, 1870

To this may appropriately be added three sentences from a letter to Mr. William Dunbar although they were written more than twenty years later — on June eleventh, 1920. "He and I had complete confidence in each other, and all our intercourse was the friendliest possible. Among the group of half a dozen men with whom I worked on the transformation of Harvard College into Harvard University in the seventies and eighties, your father and I worked with the greatest coincidence of judgment and motive. His too early death made a gap in my life which has never been filled. I look for him still whenever I visit Bear Island."

To James Bryce

Feb. 11, 1900

MY DEAR BRYCE, — This Sunday afternoon I have stolen an hour to read your Prefatory Chapter to the 3rd edition of *Impressions of South Africa*. It is a calm and wise statement. To a remote outsider there seem to have been several plain causes of the tragical issue of the negotiations. (1) The British negotiators really could not conceive that the Transvaal would not yield. That is always a dangerous frame of mind. (2) Both parties prepared actively for war while negotiating. In doing this the weaker party has the better justification. (3) The British negotiators, when their main contention was accepted, did raise further questions, and so convinced the Transvaal that concession simply resulted in fresh demands. Some remarks which we exchanged some years

ago about the personal quality of Mr. Chamberlain come again to my mind. (4) The Jingo press effectually stirred up the passions which kindle warfare.

We Americans, looking on at this horror which should have been avoided, imagine that we see some possible good coming out of it. Two stubborn combatants do, as a matter of fact, often acquire a new respect for each other. North and South did in our Civil War. It may serve the cause of peace to have all the world see that modern weapons have given the defense an immense advantage over the attack. Then the immense costliness of war will be demonstrated anew. All the new armaments are costly to prepare and are easily ruined. Men, also, are dearer than they were ninety years ago. Again, though war brutalizes any people for the time, it does sometimes give an opportunity to bring new civilizing forces into play among an archaic people. The Boers, as you suggest, belong to 1650 or thereabouts.

It is good to point out, as you do, the heroic conduct of the Free State. It was certainly very remarkable. I cordially agree with you that the argument to destiny is contemptible. We have had a sickening dose of that cant in our country of late.

Mrs. Eliot joins me in all good wishes for you and Mrs. Bryce. We hope that the war has not struck any who are dear to you. Sincerely yours,...

Letters of recommendation are so often concocted with a view to the protection of the writer rather than the en-

lightenment of the reader — and are so frequently misleading — that one is tempted to say that Eliot never wrote “recommendations.” He was constantly asked to advise about people’s qualifications for this or that position, and his replies were scrupulously informing. In April, 1900, Judge Taft, then at the head of the United States Philippine Commission, was looking for a Superintendent of Education for the Islands.

To Hon. W. H. Taft

April 6, 1900

Your letter of April 2 came duly to hand. In my opinion Mr. A—— is competent to organize an Educational Bureau, to draft an Educational Code, and to prepare school progresses from the bottom up; but an Educational Code contains many things which lie outside the province of a school superintendent. For instance, the Cuban Code determines the manner of appointment of School Boards, and the rates of compensation for all the teachers in Cuba. These are large questions of public policy.

You ask me about B——. I have met him frequently, and am generally interested in what he says. He is a man of heavy mould, and looks much more than forty-eight years of age — vigorous, rather blunt in speech, and not averse to combat. He is somewhat rough in his manners; but not objectionably so among Americans who understand each other. He is the sort of American who is more comfortable sitting in a chair tipped back against the wall with his feet on the rounds, than he is with all four legs of

his chair on the floor. This is not a fancy sketch; it is an observed fact. I can hardly imagine him commending himself to people of French, Spanish, or Italian breeding. On the other hand in — as a politically appointed Superintendent of Public Instruction he commended himself very much to his constituency; so he did in — as Superintendent of Schools, though he only stayed there two years I believe. Since he has been at the — State University he has built up the institution rapidly.

Personally I should not hesitate one moment over the choice between A— and B—. I should like A— very much as a colleague or a subordinate, and B— I should not want at all. Nevertheless I feel great regard for B—, and like to meet him at educational conferences. I cannot think that you would be at all prudent in taking B—, unless you have had opportunity to see him. His personality is a strong one, and you might not like it.

You doubtless see that this letter is only fit to be used in a confidential way. I have said exactly what I think, having a strong sense of the importance of the decision which you have to make.

Wishing you a prosperous voyage across the ocean and a fortunate discharge of your important duties, I am, with high regard, Very truly yours,...

To President Charles F. Thwing

May 11, 1900

DEAR MR. THWING, — I shall be glad to have your forthcoming volume dedicated to me. I have been read-

ing your articles on college matters for some years now, and generally find myself in accord with your views. However, this accord is not at all necessary to the acceptance of a dedication. I think I should like to have a book dedicated to me which contested in an able way all my views. I am, with great regard, Very truly yours,...

From the eighties onward proposals to abridge the time spent in College were brought forward repeatedly, and the question whether three years would not suffice became a chronic subject of discussion. The Faculties of Law and Medicine kept insisting that men ought to begin their professional studies at an earlier age, and Eliot, as has been seen, was of the same opinion. Measures were adopted which, taken together, opened an optional way to a degree in three years. They made it easier for a student to anticipate college studies while in school and obtain credit for them upon entering College, to work his way more rapidly through the total number of courses required for the A.B. degree, and to receive credit for work done in summer schools. The total result was that a slowly increasing number of undergraduates fulfilled the requirements for the degree by the end of three years without being required to.

To Professor Edwin H. Hall

June 15, 1900

I am in favor of the reduction of the regular period of residence for the A.B. from four years to three, and I am much opposed to any further reduction. When Dr.

Harper last March told me about his two year project I immediately replied that it seemed to me the way to destroy the A.B. degree. A principal reason in my mind for desiring the reduction to three years is that I believe we may so preserve the A.B. in the United States. England has preserved it on a three years' residence; Germany has lost it, and France uses it for boys. I am as far as possible from desiring the extinction of the A.B. degree and of the period of general culture which it represents.

As to what I said at Bowdoin, I meant only this: That when a young man has reached the age of twenty-one, and has completed a course of study covering ten years above the elementary school, it is more profitable for him in every sense to begin his professional training or go out into the business world than it is to remain another year in what we call college. I think a year so spent at that stage does more for the development of the young man than another year in college. I have sometimes used this argument as an answer to the representation that all the training a young man is ever to get is his college training, and that when he goes out into a professional school or into business life he goes to a wilderness which can provide no training worth having. With that view I have no patience at all. To my thinking it is on a par with the common notion that childhood is the happiest part of life. Very truly yours,...

The summer school for Cuban Teachers, described in the next letter for the entertainment of a child of ten

years, was an excellent example both of Eliot's quick perception of opportunities for national service and of the way in which he worked the University to the limit of its resources. To arrange a special summer session for the benefit of 1250 or more Cuban teachers, men and women, whom General Leonard Wood's provisional government of the Island shipped to Cambridge added a heavy hot-weather burden to the work of the college term, not only for the President but for the Faculty of the College. But the dormitories and lecture halls were there, a special fund could be raised, enough instructors could be induced to stay in Cambridge, and Eliot, sparing neither them nor himself, found it one of the most interesting and satisfying experiences he had ever been through. But then, hardly a year went by that some experience did not take on that quality and eclipse its predecessors. Another summer the same thing was done for a consignment of Porto Ricans.

To his Granddaughter, Ruth Eliot

July 7, 1900

DEAR RUTH, — Your letter of July 1st told us exactly what we wanted to know about Mamma, the children, the cows, and Peter's [fox terrier] contests with woodchucks. Also I like to hear that the wild roses are beginning to bloom, and that you have begun to cut the grass.

We have had some high winds here — first from the North-West, and then from the South-West — but as they were both westerly winds they did not make a rough

sea for the Cubans, and all five vessels had a smooth voyage. There was very little sea-sickness among them, and the transportation was certainly well managed by the War Department. Then a body of about forty students and young graduates took hold of the job of getting them and their baggage to Cambridge and distributing them to their rooms and houses. The first transport arrived Saturday, and the last one Wednesday. By ten o'clock Wednesday evening every Cuban was housed in Cambridge, and most of them had been there two or three days. They seem to be clean and neat people; they do not throw their food on the floor, or get into bed with their boots on, and they wash fully as often as the Americans do. Nevertheless they have some queer ways, — for instance, when the men want to go to bed in the College rooms they shut up all the windows tight, and lock the doors, and then they take the blankets off the beds, and lie down on top of the upper sheet with very little clothes on. They do not seem to get in between the sheets as you do. I am told that in Cuba they often sleep on cots made of sacking without any mattress or bed-clothes; — that is because of their hot climate. They all walk very slowly in the street. If a Cuban accompanies me across the Yard, he has to hurry up very much, and gets quite out of his natural pace. The women are much better looking than the men, and for women they are decidedly larger than the men. The men, or rather the boys, all begin to smoke tobacco very young, and that stunts them. They are getting used to keeping appointments punctually. Just now

an excursion started for Beaver Brook at 2:35 from the Fogg Museum. At 2:45 two of the women teachers appeared wanting to go to Beaver Brook; but our Agent, Mr. Mann, had to tell them they were too late, that the cars had been gone ten minutes. They were both very much disappointed and near crying. Last night they had a dance in the Gymnasium, and the party was just as nice as any dance I ever saw there Class Day, except that the clothes did not cost so much money....

We have in our house Superintendent Frye, Dr. Menocal from Havana, Mrs. Suarez, a teacher from Havana, and Mrs. Brooks from Guantanomo. Mrs. Brooks has an English name; but she is a Cuban who married an Englishman. She was married at fourteen, and has a son who looks forty; but she is only one year older than Grandmother. She looks about fifteen years older; but she is very active and interesting. Sometimes these two men do not come in at night until eleven, or even twelve o'clock, so I have to go to bed late and get up early.

Today the thermometer is 93 on our porch. It is the hottest day we have had.... Your affectionate grandfather, CHARLES W. ELIOT

To Daniel Coit Gilman

BERMUDA, Jan. 17, 1901

... How does it feel to be retiring? You must tell me about it at Mt. Desert this summer. I have no plans in that direction, but if I begin to feel infirm, I shall pack up at once. Up to date, I am still strong. I came hither, not

to recruit, but to do a piece of work I could not do in Cambridge; and I am doing it.

You must look back with serene satisfaction on your achievement at Johns Hopkins. It has been an original, successful and highly influential piece of creative work. There isn't a university in the country that has not been greatly benefited by what you have done at Baltimore. I am well aware that it would have been much more difficult, if not impossible, for us at Harvard to have developed our Graduate School — which was but a feeble infant in 1872-76 — if you had not built up your University so wisely and effectively on the Graduate side. Then your Medical School has been a real inspiration in the reform of Medical Education in the United States.

Your successor ought to be a very judicious and high-minded young man. As to Mrs. Gilman's successor — that is desperate.

This island is the best winter resort I have ever visited — beautiful, healthy, equable, moderate in temperatures, and comfortable in most ways — also withdrawn and reposeful. Yours sincerely,...

The "piece of work that he could not do in Cambridge" was the completion of a memorial volume about his son, Charles. He called the book "Charles Eliot, Landscape Architect," with the sub-title "A Lover of Nature and of his Kind who Trained Himself for a New Profession, Practised it Happily, and Through it Wrought Much Good." His own name did not appear on the title page, and he

always spoke of the work as "Charles's book." It was in fact made up very largely of his son's diaries and professional papers. Its closing pages, necessarily written by the father, will be found reprinted in President Neilson's volumes under the title "Character of Charles Eliot." "Charles's book" may well prove to possess enduring interest, although hardly for the general reader, because it is not, except for its final pages, a literary composition addressed to popular readers. It is, however, a highly instructive record of a brilliant career in a new profession, and the documentary material with which it is filled is arranged and explained with judgment and skill.

Eliot was still in the habit of discharging the work of his office and of attending to other matters besides with little more assistance than a stenographer could give him. His so-called secretaries, when he had any, had been a succession of students who were earning their ways through college and who did not give him all their time, and until the latter nineties he had shared his stenographer with the Dean's office.¹ In 1901 Mr. Jerome D. Greene (Harvard, 1896) was appointed "Secretary to the President." At first he was given so little to do that he had to invent tasks to keep himself busy. But soon a most perfect working understanding was established. Mr. Greene entered so completely into his chief's point of view and way of

¹ On one occasion the Faculty debated and concluded that more clerical assistance ought to be provided for various College officers. "It is clear that you want it," said Eliot, "and it had better be provided. But you will find that stenographers will not save your time; you will write more letters, and write them less well."

thought that he could compose letters that were indistinguishable from the President's. He became not a secretary so much as an assistant and lieutenant. Within a couple of years Eliot found that, as he expressed it, half his time had been set free by his aide. In 1905 Mr. Greene's title was changed to Secretary of the Corporation and in that capacity he continued to be Eliot's right hand in the University administration. Eliot would have been glad to have Mr. Greene succeed him in the Presidency. A relation almost like that of father and son came to exist between the two men.

To Dean L. B. R. Briggs

Mar. 13, 1901

... Wendell's new book [A Literary History of America] is highly interesting and meritorious. Two things which recur in it give me concern: — He implies that moral purity — national or individual — is the accompaniment, or the result, of an experience undesirably limited. He seems to think that the larger and richer the life of nation or individual is, the less the chance of its being pure. This doctrine seems to me the reverse of the truth, if any proper sense be attributed to such words as large, deep, rich, and complex. If he be right, will not the courageous youth or nation say — give me the large, rich, various life; I prefer Voltaire to Dr. Holmes.

The way he dwells on the birth or family of literary people is also, I think, a subject for regret, because it shows that he has not observed how quickly American

men and women acquire not only the manners and customs but the modes of thought and speech, and the sentiments which prevail among "ladies and gentlemen." The sons and daughters of mechanics, farmers, and shopkeepers have not only the bodily characteristics of persons of "gentle birth" but their best mental and spiritual qualities. Wendell's frequent discourse on the subject of birth and descent seems snobbish in an American, and will cause many people to underestimate his judgment and good sense.

To Senator George Frisbie Hoar

Aug. 30, 1901

... Again, I share your opinion that translation from Greek and Latin into English is good training for a man who wants to make himself an orator; but I am not convinced that it is the best training to be had; and I cannot be persuaded that it is the best by examples drawn from certain groups of English orators to whom no other form of education was accessible than the study of Latin and Greek. What an orator says always seems to me very much more important than how he says it; and the sources of sound thought and imaginative illustration seem to me to be in these days much wider and deeper than Greek and Latin literature. If you or I had to choose between a thorough knowledge of the English Bible and a thorough knowledge of the Greek and Latin classics, should we not both choose the Bible as the orator's source of thought, sentiment, and imagery? It seems to me that Shakespeare

is a better fount of oratory than all the Greek and Latin literature put together.

I cannot help attaching supreme importance to one element in the power of the orator which I have noticed that many persons attach little importance to — I mean persuasiveness. Now persuasiveness seems to me to result quite as much from the moral qualities of the orator as from his intellectual qualities. Was it not your brother who said of Governor Washburn that he had a remarkable faculty of making the jury misunderstand the case just as he did? Dr. Henry P. Walcott, Chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Health, accompanied my son Charles frequently to the meetings held in the towns and cities of the Charles River basin to promote the reform of the banks and valley of the Charles. Dr. Walcott was interested in this subject from the sanitary point of view; Charles from the landscape point of view. After Charles's death, Dr. Walcott told me that Charles was the most persuasive speaker he had ever listened to. That is, he persuaded all kinds of people to take his view of the subject under discussion. Now Charles had no arts of the orator. His language was simple, direct, appropriate; and he was obviously thoroughly acquainted with the subject, and completely disinterested; and his argument was penetrating, but not irritating. He had translated a little from the Latin and Greek, but much more, on his own subject, from French and German. I found in Dr. Walcott's statement an illustration of what seems to me the general fact, that the moral qualities of the orator are

all-important to his effectiveness; and I should add that his physical qualities are also important so far as they express moral qualities.

On the subject of oratory John Bright and Abraham Lincoln seem to me very instructive examples. They seem to me the most remarkable orators of my time, and neither had any classical training. They both had a remarkable acquaintance with three or four great English books; and that sort of intimate acquaintance with the greatest works in one's own language seems to me a better foundation for genuine oratory than anything else. I absolutely agree with you in your statement that "the best examples of the highest eloquence of that kind, so far as I know, are in the Bible, and Shakespeare, and Milton."

In other fields of intellectual attainment I am afraid to advocate the study of Latin and Greek as the best training. Burns wrote extraordinarily moving and persuasive poetry; Darwin, and Huxley, and Asa Gray wrote admirable prose; but they had very little training in the classics. Perhaps the fundamental fact is that for a person of great gifts almost any training will do, whereas no training, however good, can atone for the lack of the natural gift. Very truly yours,...

In 1902 Prince Henry of Prussia visited the University. It was known, although not yet announced, that he came to present a collection of works of art to Harvard's new Germanic Museum, and that he was bringing the gift from his brother the Emperor. The mission was one of the

efforts the Emperor, Ambassador von Holleben and certain German Americans were then making to win more popularity in the United States for Germany and her ruler. Eliot had no relish for the impending ceremonies, but saw no possibility of escape, and the Harvard Governing Boards voted to confer an honorary degree upon the Prince. It was assumed that the President would say complimentary things about the Emperor, and, as Professor A. S. Hill happily expressed it, "he froze to the occasion."

At one o'clock on March 6th a procession started from Boston for Cambridge. A dozen carriages carried Prince Henry, two members of the Harvard Corporation, the German Ambassador, the Secretary of the Navy, and other members of the official cortège. Two troops of Massachusetts Militia followed. Two or three of the militiamen fell off their horses while trying to keep up with the carriages, but it was hoped that Prince Henry did not see them. An audience had assembled in Sanders Theatre, and after the Prince and his retinue were seated on the stage with the academic dignitaries, the President, looking twice as magisterial as anybody else, addressed the company.¹

"This occasion is unique. Twice in the history of the University has a special academic session been held to do honor to the President of the United States, making a progress through the country; but never before has this democratic University been called together on purpose to do honor to a foreign prince. Weighty reasons must

¹ *Harv. Grad. Mag.*, June, 1902, p. 566 *et seq.*

have determined such unprecedented action on the part of this Society of Scholars. These are the reasons." He then referred to the Teutonic customs and institutions transmitted from England to New England; to the Puritan origin of the University which made it revere the memories of the German heroes of Protestantism; to the anxiety with which the Puritan government of Massachusetts used to follow the vicissitudes of the Thirty Years' War; to the value of the German element in the population of the United States; to the debt American universities owed to Germany's institutions of learning; and to American sympathy with the federal unification of Germany.

"We gladly welcome here today," he concluded, "a worthy representative of German greatness, worthy in station, profession, and character. We see in him, however, something more than the representative of a superb nationality and an imperial ruler. [Here it seemed to the audience that Eliot paused perceptibly.] Universities have long memories. Forty years ago the American Union was in deadly peril, and thousands of its young men were bleeding and dying for it. It is credibly reported that at a very critical moment the Queen of England said to her Prime Minister: 'My Lord, you must understand that I shall sign no paper which means war with the United States.' The grandson of that illustrious woman is sitting with us here."

The audience gasped, and the Kaiser's brother must have wondered whether his ears had deceived him. But

whatever his inner bewilderment at receiving a complimentary Doctorate of Laws in the character of Queen Victoria's grandson, he stood up and accepted it without betraying his feelings.

In the course of the afternoon there was a reception, by the Germanic Museum Association at Professor Münsterberg's house, and the gift from the Emperor was announced. There a number of ladies, wives of members of the Faculty, were instructed, by the President's wish, that they were not to be presented to the Prince, but were to wait for him to be introduced to them. So they somehow marshalled themselves into a row, and Prince Henry was led along and presented to them seriatim. It was very flattering, but it seemed that they did not know what in the world to say. — Then there was more speaking; and Eliot dwelt again on the liberal heritage that we have derived from the Germanic past.

The fact was that he attached very little importance to such occasions, unless he could find in them an opportunity to impress upon the world the dignity of Harvard University, or to assert principles in which he believed. The reason why it seemed to him to be worth while to award honorary degrees under any circumstances was probably that each one gave him a chance to express, openly or by implication, something that Harvard or he believed. To be the passive recipient of such honors himself meant little to him. This may be illustrated by another incident which connects itself naturally with the one just related.

In 1909 it so happened that an undergraduate society calling itself the Cosmopolitan Club held its annual dinner in May, and that its president, Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn, invited both the German and the Japanese ambassadors to be guests. Accordingly Germany seized the occasion to confer the Royal Order of the Prussian Crown upon Eliot. A letter from Mrs. Crawford H. Toy to Mrs. James Ford Rhodes recounts what happened.

May 29, 1909

... And that reminds me of the indignation in high official German circles, academic and political, over an incident of the Cosmopolitan Club dinner at Harvard two weeks ago. Von Kaltenborn, the President of the Club and toastmaster, told us about it. He had arranged to have the German Ambassador, who was to notify President (will you ever think of him as anything else?) Eliot that the Emperor had graciously sent him "the much-coveted decoration of the Golden Eagle," speak just before President Eliot. Then "Fair Harvard" was to be sung, then exit! Baron von Bernstorff (such a handsome, aristocratic-looking man) did his part, sat down and was followed by President Eliot. Education was *his* theme and he went on and on dilating on his theories — on and on for twenty minutes, sat down, and nary a word about the German decoration. The men were on their feet singing "Fair Harvard," von Kaltenborn stepped from his place and "punched" President Eliot in the back, but he was caroling loudly about Fair Harvard and took no notice. Another punch brought

him around with a frown. "President Eliot," said v. K., "you have not thanked the Ambassador for the decoration." A blank look, then: "I entirely forgot it — you must let me speak again." So v. K. rapped the men back to their places as they were dispersing, announced that President E. wished to say a few more words — and the incident closed. Dr. Farlow said yesterday that the rabid Germans insisted that it was an intentional insult while the more mildly inclined were only hurt because President Eliot thought it of so little importance that he *could* forget it. But bless you! did *he* mind? Not a bit of it. At Miss Irwin's reception, he wore the decoration of the Institute of France and a *button* of the Japanese decoration (which is enormous!) but no sign of the "much coveted" German favor. "Why do you wear the French decoration only?" I heard somebody ask him. "Because France is a Republic," he replied succinctly. The German decoration had arrived that afternoon.... But — do you and Mr. Rhodes think President Eliot would have made a good Ambassador to England? Mr. Lowell told me that the French decoration takes precedence of all the others....

President Taft had recently offered Eliot the post of Ambassador in London. But Eliot had declined it.

To the Reverend —

Sept. 12, 1902

MY DEAR SIR, — I daresay that my feeling about your Sunday School Union and the Y.M.C.A. is inconsistent

with my general beliefs and practices. I have often contributed, for example, to the work of the Roman Catholic Church, and in this town where I pass my summers I have subscribed to the Baptist Religious Society, and just lately to the new Congregational Church. Trying to explain my inconsistent feeling, I think I discern the following possible ground for it: the Catholic Church makes no claims to uniting several denominations, — it is simply *the* Church, and there is no other. The Y.M.C.A. and your Sunday School Union claim to be undenominational, and yet exclude Unitarians and Universalists. May not this account for my reluctance to contribute to these two undertakings, when I am a firm believer in polydenominational education, and have no objection to contributing to the work of a variety of denominational churches? I rejoice, as you do, in the blurring of denominational lines, and believe with you that the main thing to be done is to teach the doctrine of Jesus, without additions; but in doing that, I believe that the distinction between Evangelical and non-Evangelical Christian bodies ought to disappear. Very truly yours,...

The occasion for the remarks that Eliot made in the next letter was this: The Faculty of Arts and Sciences had appointed a committee to report on improving instruction in Harvard College.¹ The committee made an

¹ Members of this committee were L. B. R. Briggs, W. E. Byerly, A. L. Lowell, M. H. Morgan, B. S. Hurlbut, J. B. Woodworth, R. Cobb, O. M. W. Sprague, C. H. Grandgent.

elaborate investigation in the course of which it went outside the records of the Dean's office and the testimony of the instructors concerning the amount of reading and study they imagined their students to be doing, and induced 1757 students to answer questionnaires. Facts established by the answers forced the conclusion that the average amount of study in the College was "discreditably small."

To Professor L. B. R. Briggs

July 31, 1903

... I should have particularly liked to have talked over with you the report on improving instruction. The point in the investigation which would interest me most is this: — how can the standard of work done by the average student be raised? That is our fundamental difficulty in Harvard College. It stirs me up very much to hear college students say that two hours of work a day is all they have time for. They mean by that two hours in addition to their required attendance at lectures. The most exasperating statement, however, is that made by some of the high scholars, who declare that two hours of work a day, or even less, have enabled them to stand high. My opportunities for such inquiries are, however, very few; and I hoped that the inquiries of your committee might bring out a good body of facts on this subject.

Is it not inevitable that the students should have a low opinion of the assistants and young instructors in the large courses? Can we expect to improve very much the qual-

ity or grade of these assistants? It is not a good job for a mature man, or indeed for any man very long. These assistants must apparently be a shifting set, unless we come to the conclusion that it is better to have permanent drudges, like X——. This latter alternative is very repulsive to me....

It had long been the assumption of the Faculty that, to pass his examinations, a student must do about six hours of work a week outside the lecture room for each of eighteen courses that he took on his way to an A.B. degree. The Committee of 1902-03 did not challenge this as a theory about what ought to be the case, but showed that the actual average work was probably less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours a week and did not exceed $2\frac{1}{2}$ in a number of large introductory courses. It appeared that many men who won high grades spent half their "working time" listening to lectures. The report supplied statistical proofs that a comfortable assumption was at variance with the facts. The Committee's statement that there was "too much teaching and too little studying," not enough "intellectual vigor and self-sufficiency" among the undergraduates was a formidable criticism of the existing order.

At this point the report bore directly on the discussion of the proposal to reduce the term of residence in college from four to three years. A favorite argument with Eliot and others who advocated three years was that the students could complete in that time what they were being granted four years to accomplish. In effect, the report of

the Committee of 1902-03 replied that this was so only because the undergraduate work was superficial. The Committee avowed its belief that "a young man working week after week cannot effectively spend in study more than seven hours a day for six days a week," and concluded that if the three-year residence proposal were to be adopted it would be difficult to improve the quality of a Harvard College education.

For a decade the three-year residence rule that Eliot advocated had seemed to be on the verge of being adopted. The college Faculty voted for it by small majorities — so small that Eliot did not want to take advantage of them. The Overseers, on the other hand, though also by a small majority, persistently opposed the proposal.¹ Looking back over the history of the agitation from the vantage-point of the present day it is evident that the Committee of 1902-03 inflicted a mortal blow upon the proposal. It never again came very near to being adopted, and after new regulations that were intended to make the undergraduates do more work in each course had begun to take effect, the number of men who took six courses a year and presented themselves for the A.B. degree at the end of three years began to fall off.

Eliot was, however, so convinced of the desirability of graduating men into active life at an earlier age, and so wedded to the theory of the reform that he had been ad-

¹ The younger members of the Faculty were preponderantly opposed to the proposal.

vocating since the eighties, that he did not give up. It was the only major reform which he had undertaken and which he had not succeeded in carrying through. In his last Annual Report he reviewed its history and, while conceding the facts upon which the Committee of 1902-03 laid stress, urged the measure again. — "The present standard of labor for many lazy and unambitious young men who spend four years in Harvard College is deplorably low, or, in other words, the standard which the College itself sets for mere pass-work is so low that it can hardly be said to call for labor in any proper sense. . . . The adoption of three years as the standard residence, without any lowering of the present requirements for the first degree in course examinations, could not but raise the standard of labor during college residence." ¹

In these debates about the time that a man ought to spend in college earning the degree that had become the symbol of a liberal education, and in the discussions of the quality of undergraduate work, there appears to have been, on Eliot's side, a baffled inability to see that the question was not going to be settled by reference to conclusions about ages, nor in accordance with evidence about how many courses a student could pass in a year. The crux of the matter was the nature of the undergraduate. The problem how to deal with it was emerging as the one that must be settled first.

Eliot recognized the limitations of the boys who were coming to College as clearly as anybody could have

¹ *Ann. Rep.*, 1907-08, p. 18.

wished him to. "The striking things about the American boy from well-to-do families" — said he in a letter to a schoolmaster — "are his undeveloped taste and faculty for intellectual labor, the triviality of his habitual subjects of thought, the brevity of his vocabulary, and his lack of judgment and sense of proportion in historical, literary and scientific subjects. For thirty years we have been gradually reducing the amount of his school time, increasing the number of his diversions and distractions, and supplying him with more and more nursing and guarding at [home and in school]. Is it a promising remedy for the evils which have resulted to diminish our demands upon him for mental labor?"

This view might have seemed to render it doubtful whether he could be expected to make a profitable use of complete liberty from the moment when he entered college. It would appear to have called for the discovery of ways and means of quickening and intensifying the undergraduate's intellectual ambition — perhaps by discovering some *via media* between the complete freedom of the existing college and the complete discipline of a military academy, or by inventing something different from both. But to do this imagination was required, and Eliot's imagination seemed to halt. He kept returning to the idea that it would do to make the undergraduate work harder by telling him to take six courses a year; and he recurred to arguments that he had been making for forty years — the argument that the best way to enlist enthusiasm is to allow the individual to find what inter-

ests him by trial and error; and the moral argument that it is better to let some boys go to waste than to cramp the initiative of all. A certain incompatibility between the views expressed in the last quotation and those expressed in the next appear not to have struck him.

To Dr. Henry S. Pritchett

July 13, 1907

... You have doubtless read many essays which attempted to define the difference between college work proper and university work proper. To my thinking there is no difference at all, except the natural difference in the student's age and stage of advancement, but I recognize that many American parents and teachers think there ought to be a great difference in the discipline provided for a youth of eighteen to twenty-one, and that provided for a man of twenty-one to twenty-five. At Harvard there is a little difference in the disciplines to which these two sets of young men are subjected, but it is not a deep or essential difference. I think that a young man's character is, as a matter of fact, usually formed by the time he is eighteen years old, and that he will probably never be fit for freedom unless he is then fit. I observe, however, that many Americans of good quality have a low opinion of the American boy's capacity and character at eighteen. Such people would like to have a West Point system applied to all youth from eighteen to twenty-two. My view is that such a discipline is only suited to prepare young men for the very peculiar mili-

tary life, which has in it only an absolute minimum of freedom...¹

To Charles Francis Adams

June 9, 1904

You said at the start of this discussion about raising the College fee that you wanted the College open to young men who had either money or brains. The gist of our difference lies, I think, in this restricted alternative. I

¹ People who discuss Eliot and "the elective system" should bear in mind that the phrase has altered its meaning during a half century in which there have been great changes in American colleges. What Eliot believed in was not what the name now ordinarily connotes, but three principles which it originally signified for him. One was practical, one was pedagogical, one was moral. In the early days the elective system offered the only practical way of domesticating the new science and learning in the college, of enlarging its faculties, and of expanding the college into a university. It satisfied a pedagogical principle because it was stimulating to teachers and it enabled students to cultivate their peculiar aptitudes and develop their ambitions through the pursuit of studies of their own choice; it brought education closer to the new life of each generation. And finally Eliot respected the elective system because he believed, as a matter of moral training, in inviting the student to stand upon his own feet. No critic of what are now called the failings of the elective system would let himself be called an opponent of these tenets of Eliot's faith.

In the course of time the number of studies open to the student's choice became bewilderingly large. This happened in other endowed colleges and state institutions as well as at Harvard, and especially in those which claimed the sanction of the phrase "elective system" for their attempts to cater to all sorts of vocational demands. Many of them offered courses which their instructors were not competent to teach. It also happened that the students who entered American colleges were no longer preponderantly the children of homes in which there was a definite cultural background. They had been less well prepared at home to choose their studies, and were less frequently advised by their parents while in college. Accordingly the latter-day discussions revolve not upon the fundamental propositions which Eliot argued for in the beginning, but around points which are really problems of administration, or which concern methods of teaching.

want to have the College open equally to men with much money, little money, or no money, provided they all have brains. I care no more than you for young men who have no capacity for an intellectual life. They are not fit subjects for a college, whether their parents have money or not. I am inclined to think that you would be more tolerant than I of the presence of stupid sons of the rich. I care for the young men whose families have so little money that it would make a real difference to them whether the Harvard tuition fee were \$150 or \$225. You do not seem to care for that large class. To my thinking, they constitute the very best part of Harvard College.

I further think that the college differs from the world in one very important respect, namely, that in the college talent and power are at the stage of discovery and development, whereas out in the world talent and power get into full play and may fairly be left to themselves to demonstrate their fitness for the environment. Therefore, the test called "the survival of the fittest" is not so appropriate in the college as it is in the after life, and can be applied intelligently only with qualifications and reserves.

I cannot agree with you that the present Harvard policy seeks in a good-natured way to make those equal whom fate and nature made different. On the contrary, the essential quality of the Harvard discipline is to bring out and develop each man's individual gift and power. The College recognizes completely the fact that a very small gift, if decidedly unusual, may give the possessor a

great and wholly disproportionate advantage. It therefore does not aim at equality at all, but at the utmost diversity, careless of resulting inequalities.

Finally, I have never seen any students in Harvard College whom I could conscientiously advise to seek elsewhere a less costly education. Even the stupid fellows are better off in Harvard than they would be anywhere else. Very truly yours,...

It was at this period of his life that Eliot became greatly interested in the relations between capital and labor. The acts of certain local unions, in connection with construction jobs of which he had cognizance, excited his indignation. He began to express himself about the subject before his acquaintance with it was very thorough, learned more as he went along, and continued throughout the rest of his life to collect information and to discuss a matter which is so vast that it will be impossible to do more here than give the reader a few essential clues and leave him, if he is curious to know more, to consult papers whose titles will be found in Appendix J.

Eliot's approach to the whole subject was that of a man who thought about the welfare of democracy rather than about the aspirations of either labor or capital. "The winning of satisfaction and content in daily work — he declared — is the most fundamental of all objects for an industrial democracy. Unless this satisfaction and content can be habitually won on an immense scale, the hopes and ideals of democracy cannot be realized. There-

fore, joy in work should be the all pervading subject of industrial discussion; for it is at once motive, guide and goal." These were the opening sentences of an essay entitled "Content in Work" which he wrote in 1904. The paper is the best key to his thought, and must be read before anything else that he said can be understood.

Inasmuch as his primary concern was neither with the increase of production — which is the motive that leads most employers to enter the discussion — nor with the improvement of wages and hours, his earlier utterances seem more philosophical than practical. They talk about "content in work" as if their author could not imagine that labor can be anything but a source of happiness to a right-minded man, and they make no reference at all to the fact that it is impossible to be content with work that seems unavailing because its wage is insufficient to support life or is felt to be unfairly measured. He very seldom expressed opinions about the merits of this or that particular dispute over wages, hours, or profits. But as he went on he got to closer grips with the problem of motivation, and after a few years his interest became centered upon profit-sharing and he devoted a great deal of time to the study of different experimental attempts to create a true partnership between employer and employee.

His true contribution to the discussion of the subject is not, I venture to believe, to be sought in the rightness of this, that, or the other idea that he advanced, for what he said has been said often, though seldom so simply and

clearly. It consisted rather in the fact that while he lived he kept showing, by personal example, that the subject could be discussed in an open-minded and good-tempered fashion. It must be remembered that discussions of the relations between labor and capital were much less tolerant and reasonable before the War than they have been during the last twelve years. Those were the days of Gompers and Debs, of Roosevelt's trust-busting and of his first interference in a coal strike. Employers not only refused to recognize unions but would not meet and discuss across a table with their officers. There were very few persons who could speak in the name of the suffering public as impressively as did Eliot. His position and reputation, and above all his admirable manner were what gave significance to a meeting in Faneuil Hall in 1904 much more than any particular thing he said. He had been criticizing the unions severely and the Boston Central Labor Union invited him to address a meeting which they called on Sunday afternoon, February 7th. The invitation was a challenge and Eliot promptly accepted it. He need not have feared, and certainly did not fear, that his opinions would be resented by his audience; such meetings like "straight talk."

Two thousand people, mostly union delegates and members, crowded the Hall and the audience overflowed into the street. Eliot read a carefully prepared address and then answered questions for nearly an hour. The meeting produced an immense reverberation in the press, and Labor was gratified that such a personage, identifi-

able with the capital-owning element of the community, should consent to meet its delegates in public discussion on their own ground. His frankness and good temper made the happiest impression. In fact, it would probably be fair to say that he won the gratitude as well as the hearty admiration of the audience that afternoon, for not by words but by the more potent argument of example he made a strong appeal for open dealing.¹

¹ He had said, on one occasion not long before, that a "scab" might be a type of modern hero. In Faneuil Hall he was asked whether he still held that opinion and replied — "There seem to me to be two kinds of scabs. The more recent word for one kind is strike-breaker. I understand a strike-breaker to be a man that does not belong to the trade which is on strike, does not know anything about the business, has no skill in it. He is hired by the employer to make an appearance of occupying the deserted works or perhaps to guard them. . . Can that man be a hero? Can that man be under the government of motives which we admire? Well, the chances are that he is not under the government of motives which we much admire; but he is willing to risk his life on a contract. He does risk his life. He serves as a mercenary soldier and he shows courage and fidelity in that service. He may be a hero. The chances are he is rather an humble sort of hero. (Laughter.)

"Nevertheless, men and brethren, one of the most affecting and beautiful monuments in the world is the lion of Lucerne, a lion cut out of the rock by the genius of Thorwaldsen, and the lion is stabbed through with a spear and is dying. . . . What does that monument testify to? To the death of the Swiss mercenaries who died in defence of Louis XVI at the opening of the French revolution when the mob stormed the palace. Now, gentlemen, history teaches that a mercenary soldier may yet be a hero; and don't you ever deny the possibility of the mercenary who undertakes to break a strike, being in his heart that sort of hero who gives his life for fidelity to a contract.

"But there is another kind of scab — the man of the trade, the man who really belongs to the craft. Now, cannot he be a hero? I suppose you have observed that in times past people that the world has counted heroes have not always been very agreeable to their contemporaries. They have not been on the popular side. They have encountered strenuous opposition and obloquy. Heroes are generally men that are going against the current of their time. They are going against the opinion of their class. Emerson says that "Whosoever would be a man must be a nonconformist," a man who will

Theodore Roosevelt, who was a strong believer in inter-collegiate athletic contests, sometimes talked, as the reader may recall, as if he thought that the people who found fault with the game of football were squeamish molly-coddles. He kept himself informed about the course of Harvard athletics while he was in the White House, and if a controversy was provoked by some rough incident he was more than likely to take part in it, privately if not publicly. It was such an occasion that led Eliot to write the next letter.

Dec. 12, 1905

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:—I have read Mr. X.'s letter to you, which is highly characteristic, particularly in his description of the attack on Z.: — "Another pushed him in the face with both hands. There was no blow, not even 'straight arm,' and the hands were open." You observe that the effect of this push was to break Z.—'s nose and to stun him. Hundreds of men thought the attack was merely a heavy blow with the open hands — a blow which, under the rules of the prize ring, is foul. The fact is that Mr. X. is one of the things to be reformed in football — that is, completely got rid of. He has been for years an umpire who does not enforce the rules, and is

not conform to the regulations of his class, to the spirit of the time. But he must be something more than a nonconformist. And when I say that a scab is a fair type of hero in these days I mean the scab who takes his life in his hands and risks not only his life but his livelihood and the comfort and happiness of his family. The scab does that from time to time in all labor struggles, and I do not believe that you gentlemen can deny that a scab may be a fair type of hero."

always provided with plausible explanations for not enforcing them. I will show the copy of his letter to you to Messrs. Dana, Reid, and W. R. Thayer.

In regard to Mr. Sawyer's letter, which I return to you herewith, I can only say that it illustrates perfectly one of the great evils of football. The spectators on the two sides are always intensely partisan in their feelings. They are never able to take the same view of the same act or event; and there result incessant recriminations and a deal of ill feeling between the universities or colleges concerned.

I claim no superiority for Harvard over any other institution in regard to cheating, brutality, or quarrelsomeness, either among the players or among the alumni.

We have had our share in developing the evils of the game. I should be glad if we could now do more than our share in abolishing or reforming it, but I fear that we are not likely to. We have too much division of opinion among ourselves. My belief is that, in order to get rid of the existing Committee on Rules and get time to formulate a reasonable game and exemplify it in the practice of individual colleges, intercollegiate football should be prohibited for a time; but I hardly think that this opinion of mine is held by any considerable number of our graduates. To my thinking the most hopeful sign about football is that the players themselves are beginning to testify loudly that the game is a dirty one and that there is no fun in playing it. The surgeons connected with the game, who have heretofore been content to drug the players and patch them up, are now beginning to testify that the col-

lisions of football have become impossible for the human frame and that the injuries are, in consequence, unreasonably numerous and serious.

I see no chance of my visiting Washington at present. There is too much going on here. I entirely agree with you that the injuries which result from football are not the main argument against it, although they are entirely unreasonable in number and in gravity. I also agree with you that it ought to be possible for young Americans to play a reasonable game of football in an honorable and friendly spirit; but I have seen with mortification for many years past that intercollegiate football is not played in a proper spirit.

The story of the father who heard his son ordered to knock out his opponent did not relate to a game in which Harvard was concerned. I will try to send you a copy of the letter; but I may fail to do so because I cannot remember the name of the writer.

There is a remarkable unanimity of opinion hereabouts that the present game is unfit for college use. On that proposition I have not heard a dissenting voice for a month past. There was a good deal of hot feeling here immediately after the game between Harvard and Pennsylvania and also after the game of November 25th with Yale; but the heat has now subsided. The public in general seems to be more influenced by the number of deaths and injuries than by the immoral practices which abound in the game.

I am, with great regard, Very truly yours,...

Like flint and steel, Eliot and Roosevelt might have been intended by nature to strike sparks from each other, although — fortunately or unfortunately — there was not much tinder about where they came together. Listen to Eliot's account of a meeting in 1905.¹

"That year was the twenty-fifth anniversary of his class and as he was President I invited him to stay at my house. He appeared very early in the morning, a very warm day in June. He said he was dirty, and he looked dirty. I showed him to his room. The first thing he did was to pull off his coat, roll it up with his hands, and fling it across the bed so violently it sent a pillow to the floor beyond. The next thing he did was to take a great pistol from his trousers pocket and slam it down on the dresser. After awhile he came rushing downstairs, as if his life depended on it, and as I stood at the foot of the stairs I said, 'Now, you are taking breakfast with me?' 'Oh, no,' came the reply, 'I promised Bishop Lawrence I would breakfast with him, — and good gracious! (clapping his right hand to his side) I've forgotten my gun!' Now he knew that it was against the law in Massachusetts to carry that pistol, and yet he carried it. Very lawless; a very lawless mind!" But there can be no doubt that the two men enjoyed their meetings. They liked to stand up to each other, and I find a letter to Roosevelt in which Eliot alludes to the Sultan and the Kaiser as "your colleague the Sultan" and "your communicative cousin the

¹ Memorandum supplied by Mr. G. G. Wolkins. The report has the appearance of accuracy.

Emperor William.”¹ There were very few people with whom he indulged, in writing, his infrequent impulse to poke fun.

The next letter was addressed to a fellow-member of the Corporation — the board which was primarily responsible for the selection of a Dean of the Medical School.

To Henry L. Higginson

July 9, 1907

... It is quite true, as Fred Shattuck said to you, that Dr. — knows the business of the Dean of the Medical School as it has lately been done, and that he could do that work very well. Nevertheless, I do not want at all to make him Dean of the Medical School. We have an opportunity now to make a new declaration of what we expect from that School by appointing a new kind of Dean and letting him select the new kind of Secretary. We want to have a School which is going not only to train men learned and skilful in what is now known and applied, but expectant of progress, and desirous to contribute to new discovery. We want to have the whole atmosphere and spirit of the School a hopeful and expectant one as regards preventive medicine and medical and surgical discovery. To this end the administrative officers of the School ought to be men sympathetic with all laboratory research, and desirous of combining laboratory research with clinical research and hospital practice.

¹ To Theodore Roosevelt, July 19, 1905.

To get this sort of man, I think we shall have to take as Dean and Secretary men whose chief interest lies in medical and surgical progress rather than in the cautious application of what is now supposed to be known. In all probability both men will have to be under forty years of age. From this point of view, Dr. ——'s appointment as Dean, even if it were understood to be only for a few years, would be merely marking time. For one, I am not satisfied that marching forward is impossible for us.

To the Same

NORTHEAST HARBOR, *July* 19, 1907

... I am doing a very moderate amount of work here, and am diverting myself a good deal. For instance, today — it is now 5 P.M. — I rode horseback five miles before breakfast; between quarter past eleven and quarter of one I sailed some nine miles in a fresh breeze; and between two and three I drove six miles in a light wagon to carry a friend to the steamboat, who was leaving for Boston. The only work I have done today is to read the letters that arrived and dictate a few, beside talking for an hour or two with Dean Sabine, who arrived today to discuss with me some problems which interest us both....

Although the day in the open air described to Major Higginson gave a just impression of Eliot's physical vigor at the age of seventy-three, it seems right to add that he had given up riding on horseback, as a regular form of exercise, ten years before. The chief reason for doing so

was probably that Mrs. Eliot did not ride, whereas she did walk and bicycle with him. His good health and his great capacity for work were due in part to his ability to rest whenever he needed to, as well as to his moderate diet and regular exercise. He could catch a cat-nap almost anywhere — could lean back in his desk chair, put his feet up in another chair, instruct his secretary to wake him in ten minutes, and be sound asleep the next instant. No evening of debate could be so exciting or so trying as to keep him from going to sleep as soundly as a tired child the minute his head touched the pillow. "I hear," said he to an instructor who was suffering from a nervous breakdown, "that you are not well. I hear you cannot sleep." Then, as if he felt himself to be enquiring about something abnormal — "Do you lie awake when you go to bed?" — "I do indeed," replied the poor man; "Have you never done that?" — "Never for more than ten minutes." Indeed, Eliot seemed to be blissfully unacquainted, from his own experience, with the commonest symptoms of nervous fatigue. When his stenographer once asked him to be released for the afternoon because her head was aching so that she could not understand his dictation he wanted her to answer a question before she quit. Would she tell him, while she had it, what the headache felt like, "because he had never had one in his life."

In his essay entitled "The Conduct of Life; or Advice to a Schoolboy" Hazlitt said, "As to your studies and school exercises, I wish you to learn Latin, French, and dancing.

I would insist upon the last more particularly, both because it is more likely to be neglected, and because it is of the greatest consequence to your success in life. Everything almost depends upon first impressions; and these depend (besides *person*, which is not in our power) upon two things, *dress* and *address*, which everyone may command with proper attention. These are the small coin in the intercourse of life which are continually in request....'¹ This must have been the passage which Charles Francis Adams quoted to Eliot, calling forth the following reply.

To Charles Francis Adams

Oct. 21, 1907

... Hazlitt's remarks on dancing seem to me very judicious, particularly when he qualifies his valuation of dancing by the phrase, "these are the small coin in the intercourse of life." I have often said that if I were compelled to have one required subject in Harvard College, I would make it dancing if I could. West Point has been very wise in this respect, and I am inclined to think that Annapolis has had the same policy....

To James J. Storrow

Nov. 14, 1907

I enclose an amended copy of the inscription for the monument to Mayor Collins.² I have omitted the state-

¹ Hazlitt; *Table Talk*, Essay xvi.

² Inscription for monument to Patrick A. Collins:

"Born in Ireland and always her lover; American by early training and

ment that he was a trade unionist in deference to the wishes of the Committee; but I have not been able to adopt the suggestion that "wage earner" be substituted for "upholsterer." He was a wage earner for many more years than those from fifteen to twenty-three. He was an upholsterer and a foreman of upholsterers for those eight years. Moreover, the term "wage earner" is indefinite, whereas upholsterer is specific, and shows that he had a very good trade. Wage earner might mean a common laborer, or an operative in a highly mechanical and routine industry. I omit the statement that he was a trade unionist with reluctance, for in his autobiographical sketch Mayor Collins not only states that he was a trade unionist at an early age, but that he remained in his union as long as he was eligible, and took part in two strikes against the firms that employed him as a foreman. It is obvious that he was proud of having been a trade unionist, and I find it a characteristic part of his career. The reason for a monument to Mayor Collins in Boston is that being of foreign birth, and in very humble circumstances, he rose through many stages of employment and service to important public positions. His trade unionism marked one stage, and a youthful one but when he was a member of Congress, Consul General at London, and Mayor of Boston, he still believed in trade unionism. Very truly yours,...

varied employ; from 15 to 23 an upholsterer; at 18 a trade-unionist; LL.B. of Harvard at 27; from 1871 a lawyer; 1868-72 a member of the Mass. Legislature; 1883-89 a member of Congress; 1893-97 Consul General in London; 1902-05 Mayor of Boston; an honest, generous serviceable man."

To Mr. George Wigglesworth

Nov. 12, 1908

I find myself very desirous of having the opportunity to settle with you the terms of the endowment for the College Chapel, of which you have more than once spoken to me... There is no more characteristic feature of Harvard University than the conduct of its religious services. It expresses its liberality as regards opinions, its devotion to ideals, and the preciousness in its sight of individual liberty. It refutes the saying so common among Evangelical Protestants in this country that Harvard is irreligious. It is the only possible development on modern lines of the historical devotion of Harvard to the imitation of Christ and to his Church.

I desire very much to see the Chapel made independent of any temporary gusts of adverse public opinion, and of any indifference to religious services which might be imagined to prevail temporarily in the Governing Boards of the University. I was much rejoiced when you told me that this endowment was possible, or probable, and the more I have thought of it the more I have desired to see the terms of the endowment settled before I actually retire from the Presidency....

In the spring of the year 1909, just before his retirement from the Presidency, Eliot made a journey through the Southern States and visited a number of cities where he had never been before. Wherever he stopped meetings were got up in his honor, and he made many more or less

impromptu speeches. In some of these he touched upon the negro question, and they were badly reported. Two letters, both addressed to a man who wrote to ask him what he really said, supply a succinct and adequate answer.

Apr. 30, 1909

DEAR SIR: — The opinions which I expressed during my recent journey in the Southern States about the right treatment of the colored people were as follows: —

The Whites and the Negroes had better live beside each other in entire amity, but separate, under equal laws, equally applied as regards education, property, admittance to trades and professions, civil and religious liberty, and security of life. The segregation of the colored people implies to my mind that they should have access to all trades and all professions; that they should be in due proportion not only laborers, farmers and mechanics, but builders, bankers, lawyers, physicians, preachers, and teachers.

As to the ballot, it seems to me reasonable that an educational qualification should be required, and that the payment of the poll tax is also an expedient condition for exercising the suffrage; but whatever qualifications apply to Negroes should also apply to white men. Political equality seems to me to have nothing whatever to do with what is called social equality; but I recognize that the Southern Whites are not of this opinion. They believe that political equality may lead to social admixture, or at

any rate, to an assertion on the part of Negroes of a right to social intercourse with white people. So far as I know, this belief among the Southern Whites finds no support in the practice of any nation, or part of a nation, in which a broad suffrage now obtains, and I regret its prevalence among Southern Whites.

I observed while in the South many evidences of improvement in the actual condition of the Negroes, in their use of liberty, and in their understanding of the duties and responsibilities of freemen. Nevertheless, it seemed to me that it would take four or five generations more to teach the mass of the negro population that civilization is built on willingness to work hard six days in the week, and to be frugal all the time. It seemed to me very unreasonable to expect that people who had so recently been savages and slaves should all acquire in forty years the primary virtues of civilization. Savages are never either frugal or steadily industrious; and for [the] slave labor is a curse and frugality an absurdity.

As to intermarriage between Whites and Blacks, all the best evidence seems to me to show that it is inexpedient.

Finally, it clearly appears that the Negroes are indispensable to the industrial development of the Southern States, so that they are sure to share the great increase of wealth which is taking place in that part of our country.

I may add that my opinions, as above stated, are not newly formed, and that they apply all over the country, and not in the Southern States alone.

May 5, 1909

DEAR SIR: — In reply to the specific inquiries contained in your letter of May 1, I beg to say: (1) I do not approve of the exclusion of colored people from libraries or parks. In cities where the proportion of colored people is large it might be more convenient to provide in libraries separate tables or desks for colored people. (2) I have no theoretical objection to the separate car laws of the South, provided that equally good accommodations are provided for blacks and whites; but during my recent journey in the South I saw instances in which equally good accommodations were not provided, particularly as regards the higher priced accommodations. (3) In the present state of white Southern opinion I approve of laws against the intermarriage of whites and blacks. (4) The complete segregation of the colored people does not seem to me necessary in the Northern states, or wherever the proportion of negroes is small. It is unnecessary, for example, in the public schools of Boston and Cambridge. If, however, in any Northern state the proportion of negroes should become large, I should approve of separate schools for negro children. As to the most expedient treatment of colored people who are removed by four or five generations from Africa or slavery, I am in favor of leaving that problem to the people of a hundred years hence.

Very truly yours,...

On October 26, 1908, Eliot presented his resignation from the Presidency to the Harvard Corporation. So far

as is known he had made up his mind without consulting anybody else that the time had come for him to retire. He asked to have the resignation take effect not later than May 19, 1909, the fortieth anniversary of his election. A couple of days later a student mass meeting, which was being held in the Harvard Union adjourned across Quincy Street to the grounds in front of the President's house, and cheered him until he came out on his porch and spoke to the meeting:

"This is a great surprise, and I greatly appreciate your coming. Yesterday I was asked to talk upon the reasons for my resignation, but I refused. To-night I think I should like to say a few words to you on the subject.

"I have heard a number of reasons suggested as the explanation of my resigning. Now I am not sick, I am not tired, and I am in good health so far as I am aware. My faculties and health are still good, I am glad to say. My resignation is meant to precede the time when they may cease to be so. When a man has reached the age of seventy-four it is time to look for rest and retirement. Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, used to say that a man was no longer fitted to be headmaster of a public school when he could not come up the steps two at a time. Now I can still do that.

"I don't like to have my coming retirement spoken of with regret. It is touching to find that feeling, but I think it is something to be looked forward to with hope. We must all set to work to find some young, able, active man for the place. He can be found; we shall find him. We

need a man who will take up this extremely laborious and extremely influential position with untiring energy and carry this university to a higher plane than it now occupies. It has been the foremost American university for 270 years.

"The occupation which has been mine for a lifetime has been a most pleasant one, and I regret that it is about to terminate. Forty years of service has been given me in the pursuance of a profession that has no equal in the world. This university has grown into great proportions. It is now the task of all of us to find a man who can enlarge it still more and make it still greater. Good-night."¹

To the report of these remarks, two letters should be added. Before the date of the first Mr. A. Lawrence Lowell had been elected to succeed Eliot on May nineteenth.

To Edward Everett Hale

Feb. 4, 1909

Your congratulations on an approaching freedom for me are welcome and wise. Mr. Lowell was the most natural choice possible, since he has proved his quality as scholar, teacher, author, and administrator.

I regard the following items as the best fruits of my forty years' work:

I. The re-organization and ample endowment of the Medical School.

¹ *Science*, New Series, xxviii, No. 725, p. 724, reprinting the report by the *Boston Transcript*.

II. The re-making of the Law School under Langdell.

III. The re-building of the Divinity School on a scientific basis with a Faculty containing members of several denominations.

IV. The establishment of religious services on a voluntary basis under a board of preachers representing several denominations.

V. The requiring of a previous degree for admission to all the professional schools except the Dental School, which is moving in the same direction.

VI. The administration of the University as a unified group of departments — one undergraduate department and many graduate schools.

VII. The perfecting of the elective system as a system.

VIII. The increase of the endowments and of the number of students, due to the confidence of the public in the financial and educational management of the University during a period of remarkable development in the wealth of the nation.

IX. The remarkable rise in the scholarly quality of the men appointed to teach in the University.

I believe these are the main things which I have seen done. Of course you understand that the work has always been group work, and not one-man work.

I am, with great regard, Very truly yours,...

To James Ford Rhodes

Jan. 22, 1909

... There is one statement in your note, however, which has less than your usual accuracy — the statement that *I* have given the University and my office their primacy. I feel very strongly, indeed, I know, that the work done here during the last forty years has been group work, and not individual work; and I am anxious that that should be thoroughly understood, because otherwise some unwholesome inferences might be drawn from my obvious success — inferences in favor of one-man power. No such argument can be correctly drawn from my career. It is a strong case of “team play,” — only the teams have been numerous, various, and shifting, while all have had the same captain...

Team play there had been, truly; but everybody realized what his successor said, — that “his masterful spirit had stamped its impress on every branch of the University, and his opinions had been fused into its life until they seemed a part of the very law of its being.”

At this point I would rely upon others, and I turn to the words of two men who were eminently qualified to appraise Eliot's work and quote what they said, not during his lifetime but after his death. First, the late President Hadley of Yale: — “To [Eliot] more than to any other man — I had almost said ‘more than to all other men’ — America owes it that her system of higher education is no

longer a thing apart by itself, a sort of 'Ark of the Covenant' too sacred to be touched, but a normal part of the life of the nation as a whole." ¹ Second, President C. F. Thwing of Western Reserve University. — It was Eliot "who emancipated the higher education.... Horace Mann, in the middle and earlier decades of the century, caused the public school to be lifted into a throne of influence in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of America. To a similar place of exaltation, Eliot lifted the university.... Eliot, standing for and embodying the education of and through the college, standing also for the people, helped to make the higher education a common gift, a common force, a common achievement. College education ceased to be cribbed, cabined, or confined. It became the right and the privilege of every class of the community, of the political state, and of the social commonwealth." ²

¹ In the Eliot Memorial Issue of the *Harvard Crimson*, Dec. 15, 1926.

² C. F. Thwing, reported in the *Harvard Bulletin*, March 31, 1927.

CHAPTER XV

1909-1914

President Emeritus — Relations with neighbors and grandchildren — Relation to Harvard after retirement — Eliot's connections with philanthropic foundations and reform associations — Counsellor to the public — The Five-Foot Book-Shelf — "The Religion of the Future" — Journey to the Orient for the Peace Foundation — More letters on a variety of topics.

UPON his retirement as President of the College, Eliot moved out of the house on Quincy Street, bought one that stood on an acre of its own land at the corner of Brattle Street and Fresh Pond Parkway a mile and a half from the College Yard, and made it his Cambridge home for the remainder of his life. It was a two-story and a half wooden building that dated from the early part of the last century, was of plain but agreeable design, and was soon remodeled and fresh-painted to meet his taste and requirements. Up one short flight of stairs was a large study. The long southern side of the house, including two French windows in the study that opened from the ceiling almost to the floor, looked over a lawn and between elms and apple trees to the Lowell Memorial Park on the other side of Brattle Street.

The new house became the center of a more easy and friendly social usage than had flourished in the President's House on Quincy Street. There was no reason for Eliot to maintain a vestige of his old sea-captainly reserve toward other members of the college community any longer;



THE CAMBRIDGE HOUSE, 1910-1926



THE NORTHEAST HARBOR HOUSE

a new cordiality in his manner became noticeable and it was evident that he meant to enjoy a natural intercourse with his neighbors. He loved a party, at home or abroad, ill devised or gay. His wife might complain of having been bored; he never did. To be sure the people he talked to usually did their best by the conversation, but even on a very simple level it interested him. He pumped his interlocutors with questions about their affairs, fished up reminiscences for them from the vast storehouse of his own memory, disseminated bits of wise and homely counsel and beamed upon everybody with radiant benevolence.

In summer time his house at Northeast Harbor was full of guests and younger relatives. His son Samuel, whose family numbered four boys and three girls, ranging, in 1910, from three to seventeen years of age, had built a cottage hard-by. Another was built for Mrs. Charles Eliot and her four daughters. Eliot's wish was very earnest that his grandchildren should spend their summers there and learn, as he had at Nahant long ago, how to swim and sail and ride and explore the woods and the mountainsides. He was still a keen sailor. Indeed, at the age of almost ninety he wanted to try the new Marconi rig on his own boat.

His relations with his grandchildren were remarkably free from constraint. A happy spirit attracts young people as certainly as a gloomy one repels them, and he was always happy and cheerful at home, loving a joke, though he could not make one himself, and loving the laugh that

followed it even when he had missed the point. He liked to do something that he had learned to do most successfully — that is, startle his hearers by a pungent comment, or tickle them by rendering exact justice in a dignified period to some homely triviality.¹ Then, too, he managed admirably to advise the young folk without imposing his own code. For instance, he objected to smoke, and very definitely disliked to see women smoking; but one of his granddaughters, who was acting as his secretary and living in his house, smoked in her own room. Of course this was not concealed from her grandfather and as he was the most outspoken of men she knew that he refrained from comment purely out of consideration for her

¹ For example — (Of a marriage between a man of twenty-five and a woman of fifty-five), "It is most unfortunate. She is young and will not die." (To the laundress), "Don't worry about that shirt you tore. It was not youthful, and I have observed that some of the other shirts in the same set are tender." — (Of a lady who called to take away a stone with which she had some sentimental association), "I hope she will secure the piece of rock she has become attached to. That kind of attachment seems to add considerably to the satisfactions of life." His failures of humor were also amusing, and one could enjoy them because, recognizing his limitations, Eliot was not sensitive about them. Thus when he told Mr. Greene that he had adopted a Gillette Safety razor the following conversation ensued: G. — "How do you get rid of the old blades, Mr. Eliot?" Eliot — "They *are* troublesome to dispose of." G. — "Irving Cobb says that he never could discover where to put them until he visited the Grand Canyon and realized that it was meant to be the place for old razor blades." A faint smile crept over Eliot's face and then he said, "As a matter of fact a most inappropriate place." — One morning when he came into his office Eliot told Mr. Greene that a student, known to them both to be somewhat deranged, had called at his house at two o'clock in the morning to report that he had just had a vision in which he had been assured that the President was ready to accept Jesus Christ as his Saviour. Mr. Greene — "But what did you say to him, Mr. Eliot?" — "I said to him that he must have been misinformed." — This with no consciousness of the humor of his very diplomatic reply.

feelings. A niece who was puzzling her way through long-drawn-out difficulties tells me that there was nobody she confided in so fully or consulted so often. Eliot's interest and sympathy seemed to be inexhaustible. He listened and gave advice; she went away and did not follow it; she returned with fresh difficulties. There were no I-told-you-so's, no reproaches. The new situation was canvassed again with undiminished good will. He had, in fact, spent so much of his life looking after other people that if there had been nobody near him to care for he would soon have been unhappy.¹

At Northeast Harbor, any pretext sufficed for a gathering of the clan and if a grandchild wanted to get up a picnic it was assumed that the grandfather would enlist as the first recruit and that he would further the arrangements with zest. At one moment one of the young folk sought his advice, at another tried to start an argument with him. Or one of them would stand up before a family gathering and deliver a speech in imitation of the President's ideas and manner. Or several of them would chant in chorus, "Three cheers for Harvard and *one* for Yale," ending with a shout of laughter. Eliot would smile happily and remark — "Evidently my amendment to that impolite song affords amusement."

¹ At Northeast Harbor it was Eliot's habit to attend to the daily ordering and much of the housekeeping. The practice had grown up naturally during the early years when the provisioning of the camp on Calf Island or of the new house involved daily expeditions by boat or with a horse. Afterward it was continued in the interest of Mrs. Eliot's vacation. Eliot carried the housekeeping as easily as he did all details.

Youth! Youth, and the sweet freshness of these young creatures who were his own. Youth — with which his days had always been occupied, but too often only in stiff, official relations — here at last about him, devoted, easy, jocular, confiding, comprehending! It gave him great happiness.

In Cambridge, Eliot and his wife continued to ride their bicycles before breakfast for a number of years, but his excursions were usually drives in the motor car. For these he frequently chose the roadways of the Park System that his son Charles had done so much to create. There he liked to note the strollers, the horseback riders in the bridle paths, the carriages and other cars full of excursionists, and there it never bored him to reflect anew upon the beneficial influence that recreation, pursued among such scenes, exercises upon men and women and children. Or the run might be made to the oceanside drive and beaches at Revere, part of the great Metropolitan Park System too. The greater the crowds, the more pleasing the spectacle. Or of a Sunday he would pick up Dr. Walcott, say, and take him to Milton to lunch with his granddaughter Ruth Eliot Pierce and her husband and children. Another day he was at Waltham. The ground was dry, the sod was firm. "Why," proposed Mrs. Arthur Lyman, "don't you let your chauffeur drive you down over the grass among those lovely old trees under which you've told me that you used to play when you were a boy?" "Not lovely trees — replied the old man — *noble* trees." And his voice, conveying the depth

of a deep veneration, awoke a sense of all the years through which the trees had grown in dignity and had laid the benediction of their shadows upon the scene. He went, and his car wound its way slowly beneath them until it disappeared beyond the lawn in an avenue behind still other trees.

It would have been impossible for Eliot to sever himself completely from Harvard University, but living in Cambridge, as he continued to after his resignation, his relation to it necessarily had to be governed by consideration for his successor. He had become "President Emeritus" and most people continued to address him as "President Eliot." He consented to let himself be elected for a six-year term on the Board of Overseers. During the first years of his own presidency ex-President Walker had been an Overseer and had given him powerful aid in the Board. He believed that he could similarly help his successor more than he would embarrass him. But the conditions were different. It is no part of our purpose to enter here upon a process of weighing the merits of his policies against those of President Lowell. It will be enough to point to the fact of a divergence and to notice what attitude Eliot assumed.

President Lowell's Inaugural Address, saying nothing about the University and its graduate schools, and dealing wholly with the College, sounded the signal for the ship to come about on a new tack. Eliot believed, like a father who knows no favorites among his children, that

he had cherished all departments of the University with an equal solicitude; but the broad criticism of his administration that had been made most frequently was that he thought more of the University than of the College. There had been no university in America in 1869; he had set out to bring one into being, and he had succeeded; but in the process the College had been allowed to wander and falter in the pursuit of its mission. This, it was also said, was partly because Eliot's temperament kept him from appraising correctly the limitations of the immature social animals who make up the undergraduate body of an American College; partly because he conceived that the College should be conducted for rational, earnest, discreet young editions of himself — whom he liked to imagine but who seldom existed. These explanations of his treatment of the College left a great many things out of account; for the defects of Harvard College, however mildly or severely they might be judged, were almost equally the defects of other American colleges which were not being sacrificed to any university and over which men of utterly different personalities presided.

The reader can catch a sense of the divergence between Eliot's administration and the next one by considering a few phrases. — President Lowell spoke, in the second sentence of his Inaugural, of undergraduates who are "each imprisoned in the cell of his own intellectual pursuits." Thus he touched immediately upon one of the staple criticisms of the working of the elective system and

did so in words that would never have come from Eliot's lips. He said that college life had shown a marked tendency to disintegrate intellectually and socially. Eliot had never talked about "college life," and in the forty times forty pages of his Annual Reports it may be doubted whether he had used the word "social" with such implications as were attached to it when President Lowell added that the task of the College must be to "produce an intellectual and social cohesion, at least among large groups of students, and points of contact among them all." "May we not," he went on to ask, "feel that the most vital measure for saving the College is not to shorten its duration, but to ensure that it shall be worth saving?" The question was an unmistakable announcement that there would be no more attempts to compress the liberal arts course into three years at Harvard. But it was more; to speak about "saving" the college and "making it worth saving" was palpably to wrap up a condemnation in a rhetorical phrase.

It is not merely permissible, it is expedient that a new leader shall announce his purposes in clear and challenging terms. Eliot had done that very thing forty years before. He would have said with conviction that his successor ought to be man enough to have ideas of his own and that he must have an opportunity to put his ideas into effect. But — as a matter of general experience — the particular digressions in policy which the new administration inaugurates seldom commend themselves as severally meritorious to the retired chief. In fact it is

well-nigh impossible that they should. The items of the new program are likely to be parts of a total design that, until the mosaic approaches completion, cannot successfully be imparted to any but a sympathetic mind. For fifteen or twenty years after Eliot set out to make a University his separate projects were usually judged by traditional standards to which he had ceased to conform, instead of by reference to his new total aim. President Lowell, in his turn, has had to piece his mosaic together for nearly twenty years before its design appears easy to read.

When, as an initial step under President Lowell's guidance, the College required each student to choose two fifths of his courses in some one field of concentration, Eliot took an early opportunity to dispel any impression there might be that he, the time-honored champion of the elective system, was opposed to the change; but he stopped short of admitting that the reform was necessary. He merely explained that it was not a reversal of his own policy. At a meeting of the New England Federation of Harvard Clubs, he said, "I observe that a good many Harvard graduates have got an impression that the new administration has been tampering with the elective system. I, of course, have been interested in the resolutions and votes which have passed the College Faculty and have been accepted by the Governing Boards, but I do not feel the slightest anxiety as to the issue of these apparently somewhat new policies.

"I believe, and always have believed, that there is only

one way of teaching the young men to govern themselves, namely, by letting them try, — that is the only one way. Now, we have got to have an appropriate age, and I have always thought that eighteen was a very appropriate age for that beginning. But when I examined the new measures which have been so pleasantly described to you, I came to the conclusion that any young man going to Harvard College who could not find under this so-called new prescription all the freedom of choice of studies he needed had not wits enough to be worth a college education.

“There are no inconvenient restrictions for the good scholar in the new rules. There is a frank statement that the most liberal exceptions — I think ‘liberal’ is the word used — will be made to the rules. There is plenty of freedom to be found under them by any reasonably intelligent youth, and I feel absolutely sure that all Harvard undergraduates will find that freedom. They are good at it.

“But, gentlemen, one who has passed a few days in Cambridge during the last four months is aware that there is a little word more likely to be used toward the undergraduate in the future than in the last few years. That little word is ‘must.’ Now, again, I feel a very strong confidence in the ability of the youths that come to Harvard College to take that word with apparent submission, but without allowing it to have any inconvenient effects on the individual. The fact is that the whole temper and spirit of Harvard College from the beginning, from its foundation, has been expressed in the word ‘freedom.’ That is what the College has stood for from the begin-

ning. In the State, in religion, in industries, in the great businesses of the country 'freedom' has been its watchword, and it will remain so."¹ Beyond this, it became clear, he was unable to enter into his successor's point of view. He never became converted to President Lowell's policy of bringing all first-year students together in the Freshmen dormitories, nor to the so-called tutorial system.

Former colleagues, still active, who were also dubious about the changes that were being introduced, or who thought themselves treated less well than they deserved, came to him telling their troubles and seeking comfort. His presence in Cambridge and his approachability made this resort to him inevitable; but it might have had embarrassing consequences. He could not help being a consoling listener and he was naturally somewhat influenced by what his callers told him. Had he been willing, it would have been easy for him to become a rallying point for a malcontent opposition to President Lowell's program, especially while he was serving on the Board of Overseers between 1910 and 1916. But he very definitely did not want that to happen. So, although the Board offered him an arena wherein he was a past-master of debate, he abstained from pressing his views with anything approaching his old combativeness and persistence. As a rule he contented himself with contributing to the Board's deliberations what no one else could so well supply; that is, information concerning relevant antecedent phases of University history. When he agreed with his successor he

¹ *Harv. Grad. Mag.*, xviii, 583-84. (March, 1910.)

took pains to make the fact known; when he could not, he abstained from public criticism.

Meanwhile there were several other institutions whose affairs interested him intensely and in connection with whose work there was no occasion for self-repression. Among them were four of the great foundations, to wit, the General Education Board, the International Health Board, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He joined the General Education Board in 1908, served on the International Health Board from its inception in 1913, and was elected a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation in January, 1917. Later in 1917, he resigned his membership in all three Rockefeller Boards, and also his trusteeship in the Institute for Government Research which he had helped to found, because the journeys to New York and Washington that the meetings of these boards required of him were becoming too arduous. He was a trustee of the Peace Foundation from its beginning (in 1910) until 1919, and in its behalf he made a trip round the world about which further mention will be made.¹

He continued to be a trustee of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts until his death. He had been an incorporator of the Museum in 1870, and, as official representative of the

¹ Eliot was Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching from the inauguration of the Foundation in 1905 until 1909. When he retired from active academic service at Harvard he automatically became one of the Foundation's pensioners. Considering that, as a matter of propriety, he was thereby disqualified from sitting on its board, he resigned.

University, a Trustee throughout his presidency. Between 1908 and 1925 he assumed the chairmanship of the Museum's Special Advisory Committee on Education. "He took every opportunity," said a Minute that was published in the Bulletin of the Museum after his death, "to ask questions, which was his way of getting information, and he was ready, at all times, to give us his advice and the benefit of his experience and judgment. His knowledge of men and of principles was extraordinary. The result was, that he was constantly consulted and, from time to time, when particularly needed, he served on special committees."¹

He was the "outstanding layman" of the Unitarian

¹ The Minute went on to remark that it was "not the least of Dr. Eliot's services to the Museum that he was a leader in proposing and bringing about a right and proper system of instruction and training for students of Art.... He was not a musician, though he was fond of Music, and he knew very little of Drawing and Design, but he was the first of college presidents to propose that courses in the Theory of Music and in the Practice of Drawing and Design be offered to undergraduates in college. The writer remembers how, more than twenty years ago, Professor Hurlbut and he were sent by President Eliot to a meeting and conference where a large number of college presidents were gathered together. Representing the president of Harvard, we were to propose the admission of Music and of Drawing and Design to the list of studies offered to undergraduates. We did our best in presenting this proposition but without success. An eminent president brought the discussion to a close by saying: that those who were interested in Music should go to a Conservatory of Music, while those who were interested in Drawing and Design should go to an Art School. With such interests they should not go to college. President Eliot was not at all disturbed when we told him that his proposition had been turned down. He said: 'It takes at least thirty years to get a new idea accepted and put into practice. We must try again. In time we shall succeed.' The thirty years have not yet passed; but the idea is now very generally accepted; not only at Harvard but in other colleges and seats of learning, and it will not be long before we shall see it in practice everywhere."

denomination, and he acted as President of the General Conference of Unitarian Churches from 1911 to 1913.

His strong belief in the importance of preventive medicine and public health movements was shown by his enlistment in the work of two young associations, one the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, the other the American Social Hygiene Association. Mr. Clifford C. Beers found a sympathetic friend in Eliot during the first stages of his attempts to organize the Mental Hygiene Committee. In 1913 Eliot accepted an election as vice-president, and he continued in that office until his death. His interest in the Social Hygiene Association was particularly keen. The organization resulted from the merger in 1913 of the National Vigilance Association and Dr. Prince A. Morrow's Federation for Sex Hygiene. Eliot had previously perceived the significance of Dr. Morrow's pioneering effort to awaken a recognition of the relation of sex-hygiene to public and private health as well as to good morals, and he was characteristically impatient of the convention which made any mention of the venereal diseases a social offense and which thereby placed immense difficulties in the way of their treatment and prevention. So he traveled to Buffalo to attend the meetings at which the merger of the two original societies was accomplished; and then he took a leading part in the labor of organization and in the difficult but successful work of choosing an executive staff. He also accepted election as the first president of the new society, and thus gave it his fullest personal endorsement. His counsel contributed

much to the steady and balanced progress of the educational movement which the Association rapidly promoted. When America entered the war, two things happened which further intensified Eliot's interest in social hygiene at the same time that they brought to the Association a great augmentation of moral support from the public. Proofs of the prevalence of the venereal diseases that emerged incidentally from the enforcement of the Compulsory Service Act drew attention to the seriousness of the so-called social evil. Then, when contingents of the draft army began to be concentrated in training camps, everybody was ready to agree that the men must be protected from exploitation by prostitutes and whoremongers. The American Social Hygiene Association was by that time happily in a position to make valuable contributions of personnel and guidance to the protective work. Its endeavors during and after the war had beneficent consequences abroad as well as in this country. In 1915 Eliot retired from the active presidency of the Social Hygiene Association, but continued as honorary president until his death.

Civil Service Reform had been one of the earliest favorites of this incontinent lover of reforms. The reader will have noticed that when he was in England in 1874 he visited the government offices for the purpose of looking into the English Civil Service. The movement was then only beginning in the United States, and the National Civil Service Reform League was not founded until 1881. Eliot became one of its vice-presidents in 1902, and in

1908, having resolved to resign the Harvard presidency, allowed himself to be elected president of the League. He held the office until 1913, and his correspondence files about the work of the League would prove, if proof were needed, that he was more than a figure-head president. He was constantly ready, and was frequently called upon, to draft and redraft letters and resolutions. And when, during Taft's presidency, the inspectorship of the post-office was unexpectedly taken out of the merit system, Eliot went on to Washington, with Mr. R. H. Dana, for conferences with the President and a number of members of the Senate and House. He frequently argued for Civil Service Reform by pointing out how public philanthropies would have failed to accomplish the very purpose for which they were established if they had carried on their work under the spoils system. He used to say that the "abolition of the spoils system is the reform of reforms."

The foregoing were the most important institutions to which he contributed his services as an active officer; but there were very many more with which he allied himself in some fashion. There lies before me a list of the Leagues, Associations, and temporary or more or less permanent Committees to which he lent his name during the last six and a half years of his life, and it consists of more than 200 items. Between 1910 and 1918 the number of those to which he gave support in some fashion was doubtless no less. Every one of them involved him in correspondence; to some he contributed addresses or print-

able statements. If anyone had asked why he consented to disperse his energies so widely and encouraged such multifarious drafts upon his good will, he would have answered that it was a solid satisfaction to be able to aid so many excellent causes.¹ If a controversy to which he ascribed importance was waging he enjoyed throwing into its scales whatever weight his opinion might carry, for he believed that he could do nothing better, during the remainder of life, than to help awaken the public to a realization of things that ought to be done, and to give such things a push toward accomplishment whenever he could.

The press showed an unflagging desire to report his views. No question was so trivial or so absurd but that some editor applied to him solemnly for an answer. — “What do Life and Death mean to you? — Kindly answer in two sentences.” — “Should one say ‘a unique’ or ‘an unique’?” — “What constitutes an Ideal Home?” It appears that Eliot took pains to reply to almost every question, like a conscientious Oracle.

In fact he now presented an example of the way in which the public expects eminent men to tell it over again the truths that are ancient and familiar. Verities which are in no sense new must be repeated afresh, and are put into currency again and again through the mouths of

¹ From another list it appears that his subscriptions to organized charities and philanthropies amounted to more rather than less than ten per cent of his moderate income. There were at all times members of the large University family, students or others, who were in distress. His generosity in their cases was often anonymous, and there is no record of it.

worthies. We do not suffer Tom, Dick, and Harry to do this for us; when they try to, we call them pretentious bores. But when a Mussolini utters a sententious platitude the Fascists of Italy are inspired by it, and if a Theodore Roosevelt founds a new party on his own personality and the Ten Commandments, half the country discovers that the planks of his platform are not only interesting but exciting. At one time the popular feeling about Phillips Brooks reached such a pitch in Boston, says A. V. G. Allen, that the veriest commonplaces of religious thought or sentiment, when uttered by him, were received as if they had never been spoken before and as if their truth rested on his authority. To become an instrument of this law of popular psychology may be unfortunate for a man's reputation when posterity appraises him by the mere record of his utterances without bringing to the reading of it that conviction of his vast experience which, for his contemporaries, endowed his dicta with the weight of opinions from a high court of appeal. Even the reader who can remember feeling the spell of Eliot's pronouncements when they reached him singly and fresh may, if he now attempts to read over the accumulated volume of them, be discouraged by the mass of what he finds and by the repetitive, monotonous, unoriginal soundness of its quality. But, if his vision can penetrate the phenomenon of personal influence, it will not appear to him that Eliot's stature diminishes. It is essential to the health of Society that there shall be some people to whom it will listen when they remind it of ancient, homely truths.

This is one of the services that a good priest renders to his parish, a revered preacher to his congregation.

So, in relation to the current of public affairs, it would be fair to say that Eliot occupied, during the last years of his life, a position like that of a respected publicist writing for a fortnightly or monthly review. During several years he made addresses as often as he wrote articles, but his spoken words were always reported, and as it was his practice not to try to make money out of his relationship to public questions, he ordinarily printed what he had to say wherever he thought it would reach the most appropriate or the largest audience, rather than where it might yield him the largest fees or royalties. Thus hardly a month went by that one or two pronouncements on issues of the moment did not emanate from him in the form of an address, or of an article in the "Atlantic Monthly," or of a statement for the newspapers. The subjects of some of these will be referred to in letters and explanations that follow. On the whole they dealt, more than with any others except, of course, the perennial problems of education, with the five matters to which he had long given study: the reform of the Civil Service; municipal government; the so-called conservation movement, including therein social hygiene as well as the conservation of natural resources and recreation grounds; what he called the "serious conflict between capital and labor"; and lastly, the most difficult reform that the mind of man can grapple with, the cause of peace among the nations of the world.

One undertaking in which he was busily engaged for more than a year was exceptional and of a nature all its own.

A few weeks after Eliot's resignation had been announced he was approached by Mr. Norman Hapgood and Mr. William Patten of the Collier publishing house, with a proposal that he should assume the editorship of a library of the world's best literature. In a talk that he had made before some audience of working-people he had said that a five-foot shelf could hold books enough to give, in the course of years, a good substitute for a liberal education in youth to any one who would read them with devotion, even if he could spare but fifteen minutes a day for reading. Mr. Patten reminded him of this remark, and Mr. Hapgood promised that any assistant he might wish to have help him should be employed, and excited his imagination by telling him about the millions of books which the Colliers were distributing in subscription editions outside the usual sales channels of the dignified publishing houses. The scheme was presented as a way of putting good books into countless homes. Apparently the two men succeeded, at the first interview, in making Eliot feel like saying *Yes* to the proposal. Mr. Patten proposed that the collection should be called "The Harvard Classics" or "President Eliot's Five-Foot Book-Shelf."

Eliot asked Professor W. A. Neilson (now president of Smith College, but then at Harvard) to help him, and having secured the promise of his coöperation, and hav-

ing also assured himself that the President and Fellows of the College did not object to the name proposed for the collection, he agreed to go ahead with it.

A few weeks later he dropped the information, in the course of a speech at Atlanta, that he expected shortly to make a selection of books that would go into a five-foot shelf and would, if read for fifteen minutes a day, amount to a liberal education.

This spark set off a train of publicity which sputtered to lengths nobody's imagination could have prefigured. The promise that such a book-shelf was to be made up, on the one hand, and the difficulty of doing it on the other, seemed to fascinate editorial writers and people who address letters to the press. "No Sunday supplement or book section," says Mr. Patten, "was complete without some one's discussion of Dr. Eliot's books. It didn't make a bit of difference that nothing had yet been said about what they were to be."

When work on the fifty volumes into which the "Shelf" could be divided began, Professor Neilson was appalled to discover that the publishers expected to proceed at the rate of three or four volumes a month and that Eliot's own ideas were not yet precise. Mr. Patten had already compiled tables of contents for two volumes and these were ultimately accepted by Eliot and incorporated in the series. One contained the "Journal of John Woolman," which it has often been supposed must have been Eliot's personal selection. His theory was that epochs and developments in the world's history ought to be repre-

sented and explained, not that the collection should be an anthology of the best prose and verse. As a working procedure, Professor Neilson laid out huge sheets of paper, listing the centuries in a column at the left-hand margin and then filling in other columns with the names of categories of literature, countries, events, discoveries, topics, and so on. These sheets were then studied. "Here's the whole XVth Century with nothing to represent it in the Book-Shelf." Or, "Here's the Renaissance — what is to be selected to explain it?" "How shall folklore, sacred writings, the drama be dealt with?" — Sometimes Eliot knew immediately what he wanted to do, and sometimes he and Professor Neilson had to seek suggestions and help from other people. It is impossible to say who proposed what. The shape which the general conception assumed was outlined in an "Introduction" that may be found in the volume that contains the "Reader's Guide" — the last volume.

"My purpose in selecting *The Harvard Classics*," the Introduction said in part, "was to provide the literary materials from which a careful and persistent reader might gain a fair view of the progress of man observing, recording, inventing, and imagining from the earliest historical times to the close of the nineteenth century. Within the limits of fifty volumes, containing about 22,000 pages, I was to provide the means of obtaining such a knowledge of ancient and modern literature as seems essential to the twentieth century idea of a cultivated man. The best acquisition of a cultivated man is a liberal frame

of mind or way of thinking; but there must be added to that possession acquaintance with the prodigious store of recorded discoveries, experiences, and reflections which humanity in its intermittent and irregular progress from barbarism to civilization has acquired and laid up. From that store I proposed to make such a selection as any intellectually ambitious American family might use to advantage, even if their early opportunities of education had been scanty. The purpose of *The Harvard Classics* is, therefore, one very different from that of the many collections in which the editor's aim has been to select the hundred or the fifty best books in the world; it is nothing less than the purpose to present so ample and characteristic a record of the stream of the world's thought that the observant reader's mind shall be enriched, refined, and fertilized by it... While with very few exceptions every piece of writing included in the series is complete in itself — that is, is a whole book, narrative, document, essay, or poem — there are many volumes which are made up of numerous short, though complete works."

As soon as a table of contents began to take shape, the publishers found themselves confronted by the more or less piratical enterprise of numerous competitors. Other houses made haste to issue cheap editions of items that were supposed to be going into the Five-Foot Shelf and advertised them as "recommended by President Eliot." One publisher announced a condensed, improved and cheaper set of the books. Litigation as well as controversy

ensued. Colliers supplied one of their salesmen with an incomplete Table of Contents thoroughly jumbled up so that it would be unintelligible to others, although he, who had been initiated into its mysteries, would be able to talk from it. This work of deceptive art was stolen from the salesman within forty-eight hours and was published as news, with the result that a fresh torrent of jokes and criticisms poured itself into the press. Mr. Patten says that one day one of his clerks reported to him that he had pasted into scrapbooks a total of over 1700 columns of newspaper commentary, none of which had been prepared, promoted, or paid for by the Colliers.

Eliot was unperturbed. Of course he did not relish so much foolishness, but if his recommendations sufficed to give new currency to some good book or essay, so much the better. To disseminate knowledge and popularize ideas was always one of his chief desires. When Mr. Patten asked him whether he minded it all very much, "there was an amused twinkle in his eye and the corner of his mouth lifted a trifle, as he replied, 'I suppose it has been good publicity.'"

As to Greek, Roman, and Oriental literature, Eliot consulted experts and characteristically deferred to their judgment. In fields in which he was at home his selections were unconventional and interesting. But the difficulties of selection were of course the hardest part of the undertaking. Where, for instance, could something appropriate about Calvinism be found? Obviously, Calvin's "Institutes" were too voluminous to reprint. But

Eliot's instinct was always to go to the authentic source and to use something that was complete in itself. Finally it was decided that Calvin's Preface to his "Institutes," supplemented by the Introduction to Knox's "History of the Reformation in Scotland," would serve the purpose. Perhaps it was this that led Eliot to suggest a volume of "Prefaces to Famous Books." Certain epoch-making works, too long to be reprinted in their entirety and yet desirable to be described in the words of their own authors, might, it was thought, be represented by their prefaces; and this finally led to a compilation of one of the most interesting volumes of the series. Copernicus' "Dedication" to his Astronomy and Johnson's Preface to his Dictionary will be found in that volume. Copernicus' Dedication having never, it seemed, found its way into English before, had to be specially translated.

Eliot's intention to emphasize the development of civilization and the history of human thought was noticeable in such inclusions — to name but a few — as the whole of St. Augustine's "Confessions," Darwin's "Origin of Species," Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," and two volumes of the world's sacred writings. It also seems clear that the entire volume given to Manzoni's novel and another entire volume given to Dana's "Two Years Before the Mast" reflected the taste of his youth. Essays selected from Emerson's writings filled one full volume.¹

¹ Eliot kept a complete set of Emerson in the house at Northeast Harbor as well as in his library in Cambridge. He knew Emerson's essays almost as well as he knew the Bible. Some people have said that he was not a man of

When it came to poetry, he wanted to take in all of Milton's poems and all of Burns's. Said he in the Introduction:

"The poems of John Milton and Robert Burns are given in full; because the works of these two very unlike poets contain social, religious, and governmental teachings of vital concern for modern democracies. Milton was the great poet of civil and religious liberty, Puritanism, and the English Commonwealth, and Burns was the great poet of democracy. The two together cover the fundamental principles of free government, education, and democratic social structure, and will serve as guides to much good reading on those subjects provided in the collection."

Beyond the work of these poets and parts of the great classics — Homer, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe, the selecting of numerous short English poems would have taken too long. But Eliot had a very high opinion of the Golden Treasury, and so the whole of that anthology was put in along with about twice its bulk of other poems shuffled into its contents more or less on the basis of Professor Neilson's selections. Eliot's prejudices were sometimes not to be overborne. When anything of Rous-

literary tastes in the accepted sense of the phrase. This was only a half truth. He did not love books for their own sake or browse among the classics with a literary connoisseur's delight in their charm. But he *used* books; and in this he was aided by his talent for consulting other men and by the number of experts in different fields of knowledge who were always at hand and ready to supply him with information and references. His memory was most unusual, and so he gradually accumulated a knowledge of history and the world's thought such as few men of admitted "literary taste" possess.

seau's was discussed he adverted sooner or later to Rousseau's disgraceful desertion of his children; but finally he admitted the discourse on the causes of inequality among men; and "The Profession of Faith of a Savoyard Vicar" from "Émile."

A final volume, which makes the collection more useful than the most intelligently compiled libraries of selections usually are, contained chapters of advice for the guidance of readers who might approach the Five-Foot Book-Shelf with a particular purpose; that of considering the history of civilization, for example, or of studying the drama, or biography, or letters; or who might be especially interested in religion and philosophy, or politics, or voyages and travels.¹

While he made full acknowledgments, in the Introduction, to everybody who had helped, Eliot took upon himself, correctly, full responsibility for the selections.

It was easy enough to laugh over what happened during the compilation of the Five-Foot Shelf, but when the fifty volumes had been completed, their reception proved that they had been admirably devised to meet a popular demand. They are still, after more than fifteen years, being bought in large numbers. The publishers count that they have sold a total of 350,000 sets, amounting to 17,500,000 volumes. Nobody foresaw or would have dared to reckon upon such a market. Eliot, whose motive was educational and altruistic, had not bargained for a

¹ The contents of the Book-Shelf, so far as the titles of the separate volumes show it, is given in Appendix F.

financial reward proportionate to the sales. His satisfaction over them was, however, unalloyed.

Mr. Finley Peter Dunne who, in the person of "Mr. Dooley," then occupied the post of humorist in ordinary to the American public, seized upon the Five-Foot Book-Shelf as a pretext for his paper on "Books." Representing Eliot, just retired from the presidency, as a freshman entering the "celebrated University of the Wicked Wurruld" he said — "Charles seems to me to be th' normal healthy boy. He does exactly what all freshmen in our university do whin they enther. He tells people what books they shud read, an' he invints a new relligion. Ivry well-orthered la-ad has to get these two things out iv his system at wanst."¹

The "new" religion that Mr. Dooley attributed to Eliot was that described in "The Religion of the Future," a paper read before the Summer School of Theology in July, 1909, and just then obtaining a wide circulation in the volume which Eliot entitled "The Durable Satisfaction of Life."² It was his most complete statement of his theological views, and for that reason deserves to be summarized.

"The religion of the future — he said — will not be based on authority, either spiritual or temporal. The decline of the reliance upon absolute authority is one of the most significant phenomena of the modern world."

¹ "Mr. Dooley Says," 134-35. (*Scribner's*, 1910.)

² See also in Neilson, p. 576.

It will indulge in no personifications of the primitive forces of nature, such as light, fire, storm. "There will be in the religion of the future no worship, express or implied, of dead ancestors, teachers, or rulers; no tribal, racial, or tutelary gods; no identification of any human being, however majestic in character, with the Eternal Deity." Its primary object will not be the personal welfare or safety of the individual, either in this world or in the next. The religious person will not think of his own welfare or security, but of service to others and of the common good. The new religion will not teach that character is likely to be suddenly changed. It will not be propitiatory, sacrificial, or expiatory. Nor will it perpetuate the ancient anthropomorphic representations of God. It will not be gloomy, ascetic, or maledictory, and will deal with joy and life rather than with sorrow and death. It will be thoroughly monotheistic and the older conceptions of the Deity will be merged in it with the biological conception of a vital force, for it will deem the universe to be pervaded by the Infinite Spirit and will accept literally and implicitly St. Paul's statement, "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." "It will be an all-saints religion. It will treasure up all tales of human excellence and virtue. It will reverence the discoverers, teachers, martyrs, and apostles of liberty, purity, and righteousness. It will respect and honor all strong and lovely human beings,—seeing in them in finite measure qualities similar to those which they adore in God."

To the wretched and down-trodden of the earth religion

has in the past held out hopes of future compensation. Can the future religion promise compensation for the ills of this world any more than it can promise aid against threatening disaster?

Eliot's reply involved a dismissal of the supernatural. "This does not mean that life will be stripped of mystery or wonder, or that the range of natural law has been finally determined; but that religion, like all else, must conform to natural law so far as the range of law has been determined." It must place no reliance upon magic or miracle or magical rites. "Its sacraments will be, not invasions of law by miracle, but the visible signs of a natural spiritual grace, or of a natural hallowed custom." Its priests will be men especially interested in religious thought, possessing an unusual gift of speech on devotional subjects, and trained in the best methods of improving the social and industrial conditions of human life." "The advent of a just freedom for the mass of mankind — said Eliot — has been delayed for centuries" by the effect of compensatory promises respecting the hereafter that have been issued by the churches, and the religion of the future will approach the whole subject of evil from another side — "that of resistance and prevention." "The new religion will magnify and laud God's love and compassion, and will not venture to state what the justice of God may, or may not, require of himself, or of any of his finite creatures." If it be asked what comfort for human ills such a religion could offer, Eliot answered, "The consolation which often comes to the sufferer from being more

serviceable to others than he was before the loss or the suffering for which consolation is needed"; that of being wiser and tenderer than before. These consolations "are just those which Jesus said summed up all the commandments, love toward God and brotherliness to man." "The work of the world must be done; and the great question is, shall it be done happily or unhappily? Much of it is to-day done unhappily. The new religion will contribute powerfully toward the reduction of this mass of unnecessary misery, and will do so chiefly by promoting good will among men." And again, "The future religion will have the attribute of universality and of adaptability to the rapidly increasing stores of knowledge and power over nature acquired by the human race. As the religion of a child is inevitably very different from that of an adult, and must grow up with the child, so the religion of a race whose capacities are rapidly enlarging must be capable of a corresponding development."

Finally, the religion of the future "is not only to be in harmony with the great secular movements of modern society — democracy, individualism, social idealism, the zeal for education, the spirit of research, the modern tendency to welcome the new, the fresh powers of preventive medicine, and the recent advances in business and industrial ethics — but also in essential agreement with the direct, personal teachings of Jesus, as they are reported in the Gospels. The revelation He gave to mankind thus becomes more wonderful than ever."

Such, summarily condensed, were the conclusions of

the paper. Its argument, so far as the address was argumentative as well as declaratory, looked for support to historic evidence that the thought of civilized man has tended increasingly to use democratic modes, to accept the teachings of science, to strive for human progress and to emphasize the value of the Christian gospel of brotherly love.

Aside from the temporary task of editing the Five-Foot Book-Shelf, Eliot's occupations were, as the reader will have recognized, chiefly consultative and advisory. His correspondence occupied a larger part of his day than ever before, but he did not complain of it, and there can be no question that he enjoyed it. Accordingly, we cannot do better than to turn again to the letter files.

He read everything in the shape of a letter that the post brought to him, considered it with due care, replied to communications that other people would have thrown away, and answered most considerately when his advice was sought. He dictated his answers — in fact, he dictated almost all his correspondence now — expressing his thought in the succinct and orderly way that had long since become habitual, and seldom finding it necessary to correct himself. But although his secretary did her work with great accuracy, he never allowed himself to sign letters that he had not read over.


The first of the letters that now follow was written from Northeast Harbor to four granddaughters whom their mother, Mrs. Charles Eliot, had taken to Europe. What

comes after it is an extract from a reply dictated to a labor unionist who complained about something that Eliot had said. Then follow several letters which call for no editorial explanations.

June 27, 1910

DEAR CHILDREN — ALL FOUR:

We miss you much, but we like to hear that you are enjoying yourselves, and learning something. Those joys are best which increase by repetition and practice — like joy in music, in landscape and in art. Learning something is a joy in itself; but if the acquisition enables you to make yourselves more useful or helpful to other people, you will have obtained a new source of satisfaction for the rest of your lives.... You cannot imagine how beautiful it is here. Memory doesn't keep the pictures as lovely as they really are. It is thirty years since grandmother and I first studied these views, and we have been here every summer but one (1887) and yet we are always surprised, and freshly delighted with the loveliness of land, and sea, and woods.... Now we are going to drive together to Somesville with Beau in the small wagon, and confidently expect to have a very pleasant afternoon. You see that though we are old, we are still lovers. I hope you will all have the same experience. It is one of the best satisfactions of life. The living presence of children and grand-children enhances it; and memories of common experiences together, some sad but many joyful enrich it. It is the natural fruit of



CHARLES W. ELIOT AND HIS GRANDSON CHARLES W. ELIOT, 2d
About 1906

loving. Enjoy food and drink and exercise and repose and all things beautiful, but be sure that thinking, working, and loving are the real sources of lasting happiness.

GRANDFATHER

To ———

Nov. 7, 1910

DEAR SIR, — I have just received your excellent letter of November second. I seldom receive a letter better expressed, or a letter on a controversial subject expressed with greater moderation. If your conceptions of my views concerning unionism have been based on such newspaper extracts as you chance to have seen, I think that you will find my views to be really more reasonable than you now think them, if you will read the whole of a little book on "The Future of Trades Unionism and Capitalism in a Democracy," lately published by George P. Putnam's Sons, New York. You will find in that book that I recognize the good the unions have done as well as the evil, and that I see clearly the evils of capitalism. My objections to both unionism and capitalism are not so much material and industrial, as moral....

It is quite natural that you should distrust my views on civil service reform, because you disapprove my views on unionism. All of us reason in that way about other men's opinions or arguments. Nevertheless, I venture to think that the merit system, in regard to governmental appointments, in contrast with the political spoils system, ought to command the support of every intelligent trades unionist. Efficient business administration throughout

all governments, national, state, and municipal, is in the interest of every citizen, rich or poor, employer or employed, native or alien; and we can never have efficiency in governments until the merit system replaces the patronage system. Very truly yours,...

To a young man who addressed questions to him in the interest of a discussion of the value of language studies Eliot sent this statement —

Jan. 3, 1911

DEAR SIR, — In reply to your letter of December twenty-ninth I beg to say that so far as I can judge such capacity in the use of the English language as I possess has been derived from the following sources: (1) early study of the Latin language; (2) the habit in youth of committing to memory good English poetry and prose in considerable quantity and variety; (3) habitual reading of and listening to the English Bible; (4) practice in early manhood in writing scientific papers and textbooks on chemistry in such a way that it should be difficult to misunderstand any sentence therein; (5) constant practice during middle life in the discussion of educational topics with persons or bodies that I hoped to persuade to take action in accordance with my views, but who were not inclined to do so.

So far as I know, the study of modern languages did not contribute to my use of English. On the other hand, the mathematics and science I studied, although they did not directly contribute to my facility in the use of English, did

probably set for me a standard of accuracy and precision in the use of words, and did make me careful about the inferences I drew from observed facts. In other words, I think I gained the advantage which ought always to result from the study of science — practice in the just use of the strictly limited inference. Carelessness in the determination of facts and inaccuracy in the drawing of inferences are the faults I see oftenest in the works of authors who never had any scientific training.

So far as I remember, I never had any special instruction in the “technique of oratory, elocution, and public speaking,” — although occasional declamation before the school was required of all boys in the Boston Public Latin School when I was a member of it.

So far as I know, “fertility” of expression is partly a natural gift, and partly the result of practice under the pressure of necessity.

I venture to express the hope that the Department of Education of the University of Wisconsin will recognize the fact that there is no such thing as general or universal educational value in any subject of instruction; but only infinitely varied value for different individuals. A subject which may be of infinite value to one student may have no value at all for another; and average educational values are meaningless, and indeed, misleading.

Very truly yours,...

The reader will recall that Mr. Forbes, next addressed, was Governor of the Philippines in 1911.

To Governor W. Cameron Forbes

July 20, 1911

... I also agree with you entirely that personal independence, based on independent economic conditions, is a necessary preliminary to political independence. I just now made for the City of Boston the Fourth of July address at Faneuil Hall, in which I maintained that the political independence of our people in 1776 resulted from the very independent mode of life, socially and industrially, which the earliest settlers on the Atlantic coast and their descendants had enjoyed for over two hundred years. I went on to say that political independence in itself is of limited value, unless it is accompanied by a fair degree of industrial independence. When I get the printed copies of this address, I shall have the pleasure of sending you one.

The puzzle about the bringing-up of a backward race under the control of a superior is, that there is no natural time-limit to the control exercised by the abler race; and the backward race will remain dependent so long as they are subject to the active control of the superior....

If I were in your place, my main object would be to develop among the Filipinos the earning-power of the individual in agriculture and the fundamental trades like those of the carpenter, mason, blacksmith, printer, wheelwright, baker, painter, and fisherman. It was in these occupations that the American colonists between 1620 and 1776 built sure foundations for their political liberty. Would it be possible for you to copy in the Philippines the

itinerant teaching of agriculture which the United States Department of Agriculture and the General Education Board (Rockefeller's educational foundation) have been carrying on in the Southern States for the last five or six years? That is, teaching addressed to the individual farmer through familiar lectures, exhibitions, practical lessons, and model farms carried on by individual farmers as neighborhood exhibits. For uplifting the negroes and poor whites in the South, this is the very best work which has been done there since the Civil War. This teaching inculcates and makes possible individual independence, and the kind of neighborhood coöperation which contributes to the independence of the individual. The people that made the government of the United States possible were farmers, fishermen, and mechanics. In my opinion, the nineteenth-century operative-class would never have done it. Neither would the trades-unionists or associations of capitalists have done it, — in spite of all the material wealth which such combinations are capable of producing....

No record of what Eliot said about Lincoln some time in the spring of 1911 has been found. But its tenor may be inferred from notes written to two persons who pro-tested.

April 11, 1911

DEAR MR. —, — Yours of April tenth is at hand. The historian in the twenty-first century will undoubtedly point out that Abraham Lincoln grew wonderfully to his

task. He was also honest in the sense that he said what he thought and lived up to his standards; but his standard of political honesty was set higher and higher as the war went on. Yet to the end he used appointments in the national service as means of rewarding friends, quieting dissent, and influencing legislatures. I do not suppose that the historian will forget either his shortcomings or his extraordinary achievements when the time comes to write real history about him. Therefore it does not seem to me that he will ever stand on the same level as Washington. Intellectually he was very superior to Washington. His sympathies were wider and his experience of life more pathetic, and therefore more interesting to his own and to later generations; but morally he was inferior to Washington. His humble origin, his faith in freedom, his kindly wit, the prodigious burden he bore, and his tragic death will forever endear him to free peoples. Nevertheless,

“Broader minded, higher souled, there is but one
Who was all this, and ours and all men’s,
WASHINGTON.”

Sincerely yours,...

April 13, 1911

DEAR MADAM, — When I remarked that President Lincoln made a very shocking appointment to the most important place in his Cabinet at the beginning of his first administration, I referred to his appointment of Simon Cameron as Secretary of War. Cameron was a

corruptionist of the worst sort; and his administration of the War Department was so outrageous that it was absolutely necessary for President Lincoln to dismiss him within ten months. I mentioned no other person but Simon Cameron.

The truth about Lincoln ought not to distress you or anybody else. He grew to his work mentally and morally, and his achievements will be forever memorable; but the fact remains that he regarded all public offices as political spoils, and that he made many bad military appointments for political reasons, thereby prolonging the war and bringing death and wounds to many thousands of men. These are facts which history has already recorded, and will continue to record. Nevertheless, Lincoln will stand for all coming time as a hero of freedom and democracy; and he deserved that immortality.

The enclosed report is not correct verbally, but fairly represents what I said. Very truly yours,...

To A. V. Dicey

Oct. 2, 1911

DEAR DICEY, — Yours of September nineteenth reached me just as I was moving from Mt. Desert to Cambridge.

I feel very strongly the inevitableness of constantly increasing governmental action for the public good, in spite of the fact that such action seriously interferes with the liberty and initiative of the individual, — although it promotes in many respects the welfare of the individual as well as the welfare of the mass. The action of govern-

ment in all matters relating to preventive medicine illustrates perfectly the indispensableness of government interference. It is impossible for the individual to protect himself against contagious diseases or against insect pests. Nothing but the collective force of the government can afford the needed protection. I cordially agree with you, however, that the Continental European reliance on governmental action instead of associated private action kills public spirit and individual initiative.

I agree with you also that much state interference is based on new humane sentiments felt by all classes and creditable to all. It is also based on the new achievements of applied science, which have enabled government as well as corporations and private individuals to promote human welfare in manifold ways impossible fifty years ago.

Partly from desire to see the larger part of the world and the world's people, and partly in the hope of getting and imparting some useful ideas on education, preventive medicine, religion, and international relations, Mrs. Eliot and I start for India in a month, proposing to see the Orient. Ruth is going with us. She is a first-rate-traveller, and in general a cheering and supporting presence. She is at this moment in Munich, and will join us in Genoa on November sixteenth, on our way to Ceylon and India. Now and then, this venture seems to Mrs. Eliot and me a rash one; but the most careful consideration has failed to develop any sound reason against undertaking it. We both have the use of all our senses, and are

reasonably active. If you have a former pupil highly placed in any British dependency, please send me a note of introduction to him. I do not leave Cambridge until November fifth. Affectionately yours,...

The journey around the world, which has just been mentioned, was undertaken on behalf of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. That Endowment recognizes that one phase of its work may be the promotion of international visits by representative men of influence and standing. The educational value of such visits is two-fold. In the first place the addresses delivered by the traveler in the countries that he visits bring to people of those countries knowledge of the history, culture and ideals of the nation the visitor represents. In the second place such a visitor brings back to his own home a wealth of information about other peoples, which information he usually imparts to his fellow citizens from time to time through the medium of interviews, addresses, articles in the newspapers and magazines, and books.¹

The Endowment proposed, at first, that Eliot should make a "good-will visit" to Japan only; but he concluded, after some deliberation, that as he had never been in the Orient he had better prepare himself by visiting first some of the British possessions, the Philippines and China. This was readily agreed to. It was expected that he would also make a report to the Trustees "as to

¹ See the Year Book of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1913-14.

what activities may wisely and helpfully be planned in and for the Asiatic countries that will advance the cause of Peace and International Goodwill."

The party that embarked for Cherbourg on November 7, 1911, in pursuance of these intentions consisted of Mr. and Mrs. Eliot, his son Charles's eldest daughter Ruth, and Mr. Roger Pierce, who accompanied him as his secretary. His plan was to proceed rapidly to Ceylon, and thence to go to India, Java, the Philippines, China, Japan and Hawaii. Some pains were taken to insure that the trip should not take on a diplomatic or official character.

The programme for the first months in the East came to little, however; for almost as soon as he reached Ceylon, he was seized with an acute attack of appendicitis. On the ninth of January he was operated upon in the Government Hospital at Kandy.¹ This illness caused three months' delay and compelled him to abandon his

¹ "The English (?) doctor said to me on Friday Dec. 8th — 'I've got the best surgeon in Ceylon as consultant. He's colored. You won't mind, will you?' I said 'No, I want the best surgeon.' So it was Dr. Paul, chief surgeon of the Colombo Hospital, a Tamil and decidedly black, who took out my appendix the next morning....' (From a letter to Dr. H. P. Walcott, Jan. 25, 1912.) While Eliot was emerging from the effects of the anæsthetic he suddenly shouted angrily: "I'll spoil your chowder for you! I'll spoil your chowder!" — over and over again. He had imagined, so he explained when he was told about this afterwards, that he was a little boy at Nahant once more, and that he was throwing stones at the picnic party that had ordered him away from its fire and its chowder-pot. (See Vol. I, Chapter I, page 21.) One cannot help wondering what flash of association thus fused together two moments that were separated by seventy years — Had there been no other occasion in the interval when he had been helpless to resist another's will? or no other when he realized that he had lost his self-control?

plans for visiting India, Java, and the Philippines and to go straight on to China and Japan.

It would be hard to name an American who could have counted upon a more cordial welcome and a more attentive hearing for whatever he wished to say in China and Japan. Many of the young Chinese who were playing leading rôles in the struggles of the new Chinese Republic had been educated in the West. Several of them had studied at Harvard; and all of them who had been in America knew Eliot by reputation, recognized that he stood aloof from diplomatic and political intrigue, and regarded him as a person of such eminence that his visit was to be taken as a high compliment. Japanese students had been resorting to Harvard and other American universities in greater numbers than had been the Chinese.

We could wish that he had informed us what he thought of certain men whom he met in the course of this journey; for instance how Sun Yat-sen, with whom he had an interview, impressed him. But nobody who met so many interesting people could have omitted more disappointingly to make descriptive notes. There is nothing about Sun Yat-sen in Eliot's letters except a remark that he emphasized "the dependence of China and her helplessness before the Great Powers." The nearest approach to a delineation of any one is contained in two sentences about the Viceroy of the Old Régime who had turned himself into the President of the new Republic: "Yuan Shih-Kai is an able and interesting man, with a good deal

of personal charm, and he was in better physical condition than I had been led to expect. He eats too much, takes no exercise, and goes out of doors very little, because he cannot go out to walk or drive without having the most elaborate precautions taken for his safety." When Mr. Charles R. Crane asked Eliot about Yuan Shih-Kai he replied, "That man has no business with the power he holds. He takes no exercise. He sits all day and he has a thick neck. He'll blow up some day." This was said in the spring of 1916. Three months later Yuan did blow up; he died.

The report which resulted from this trip around the world was published under the title "Some Roads Towards Peace."¹ It was not long and dealt almost wholly in broad impressions and recommendations. A letter, soon to be quoted, will give a clue to some of these. One of his conclusions was that Asia has been held back by her addiction to reasoning from general principles and her inability to make use of inductive reasoning from patiently investigated facts. For this he naturally recommended Education.

One definite consequence of his Chinese visit and of a conversation with the Premier, Tong Shao-Yi, who professed himself to be embarrassed by the difficulty of selecting advisers without placing China in the hands of

¹ *Publication No. 1, of the Division of Intercourse and Education of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.* (Washington, 1913.) The first edition of 5000 copies was followed by a second edition of 25,000. Extracts from it were republished in 1915 in a little book of Eliot's papers and addresses entitled "The Road Toward Peace."

the foreign offices of the Western Powers, was that the Chinese Government acted on Eliot's suggestion and requested the Carnegie Endowment to nominate a suitable scholar to serve as technical adviser on Constitutional and Administrative Law. In response to this request, Frank P. Goodnow, LL.D., was designated and went out to China.

Eliot and his party stopped at Hawaii on the way home and reached Boston August 10, 1912.

The journey around the world on behalf of the Peace Endowment naturally increased Eliot's interest in the promotion of peace between nations.

To Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler

KANDY, Mar. 8, 1912

DEAR MR. BUTLER, — I have made a good recovery from the appendicitis which arrested me at this place, and am feeling like either work or play in moderation. It is unlikely that I shall do anything imprudent, so vigilant is the watch kept upon me by my three wise companions. For a month past we have been travelling about in this beautiful Island enjoying its various scenery and its various climates. Next Sunday (10 Mar.) we sail from Colombo for Singapore and Hongkong. Before I leave these Eastern countries controlled by Great Britain, I want to give you an outline of *some* of the ideas which have been running in my mind since I lived in this Crown Colony, and to suggest a piece of work for the Carnegie Endowment. The ideas are by no means new; but the piece of

work suggested has never been done, so far as I can ascertain — at least in the way I propose.

I. The Pax Britannica has practically put an end to the racial and religious warfare which from time to time desolated the Asiatic countries over which British influence now extends. Small outbreaks of racial antipathy or religious fanaticism occur locally; but these are insignificant exceptions to the prevailing tranquillity. The fighting Great Britain has done to obtain and maintain this influence over multitudinous populations has been fighting on a small scale, compared with the fighting which went on between European nations during the XIX century. The Pax Britannica has therefore been a great contribution to the peace of the world.

II. The probable causes of international war have changed within fifty years. Dynastic and religious wars and wars in support of despotic government are no longer probable. The causes of war in the future are likely to be national distrusts, dislikes, and suspicions which get nursed and hotly expressed over clashing commercial or industrial interests, over contests for new markets and fresh opportunities for profitable investments, and over extensive migrations of laborers.

III. If, then, the most probable causes of war in the future are national or racial states of mind created or developed by competitive economic and commercial conditions, how can the Pax Britannica be made to last in an age when every vigorous people yearns to determine its own destiny and win its own place in the world, and feels

the general stir in that direction, and when all the strong Western Powers are struggling for commercial extension and new fields for the profitable employment of their capital and their enterprising citizens? Only by promoting steadily and effectively the economic well-being and the self-respect of the Asiatic peoples now under British control.

IV. With some exceptions British policy seems to be now-a-days intelligently directed to the promotion of the material well-being of the subject Oriental peoples, although not evenly in the different colonies. In developing their self-respect, with the associated virtue of self-control British policy has been less successful; but in this regard there are clear signs of improvement in the prevailing sentiments of the British government and the British people. The fundamental object of English colonization is, as it always has been, the extension of British trade and the increase of British wealth; but it is now the accepted opinion that these objects can be best accomplished by increasing the intelligence, skill, and wealth of the populations controlled, raising their standards of living, relieving them from superstitious terrors, social bondages, and industrial handicaps, and creating among them new wants and new ambitions.

V. The principal means to these worthy ends are (a) education both elementary and advanced, and particularly the instruction of young people in the fundamental trades, and of adult cultivators in the best methods of producing their chief crops (compare the instruction in

agriculture given by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the General Education Board in the Southern States), (b) preventive medicine, and an effective public health organization directed to the relief of suffering, the prevention of sweeping pestilences, and the increase of industrial efficiency, (c) sound legislation concerning migratory labor and the means of securing for large-scale industries an adequate supply of trustworthy labor, (d) liberty of association and incorporation with limited liability for commercial, industrial, educational, religious, and charitable objects, (e) the levying of taxes under public law, and their collection by public salaried officials, and (f) courts which command public confidence.

VI. In respect to these well-recognized means of promoting public well-being and happiness among any people that has lived long under despotic government, I find considerable differences to exist in legislation and in practice under existing laws among the British dependencies in this part of the world, namely, India, Ceylon, Burmah, Straits Settlements, and Federated Malay States. Moreover, legislation and practice in any one of these dependencies are liable to be much influenced by successful action taken in some other, particularly in regard to education, preventive medicine, and labor legislation. Yet there exists no comprehensive compact, and fresh comparative statement of present legislation and practice on the six matters mentioned above, paragraph V, in the five countries named.

I suggest, therefore, that the Carnegie Endowment for

International Peace could do a useful and appropriate piece of work by causing such a comparative statement to be prepared by a competent scholar, and publishing it to inform publicists and British colonial administrators, and to stimulate, through emulation and competition, progressive governmental well-doing in the countries named, and in others where like problems arise (e. g. the Philippines)....

The next letter returns to the subject of university administration in America.

To Dr. Francis Greenwood Peabody

KANDY, Feb. 12, 1912

DEAR FRANK, — ... Paton's doctrine in the article from *Science* which you send me¹ is sound and familiar on its last three pages but has no application to Harvard. His earlier pages show that he has not assimilated the history of Harvard and Yale since 1847 or a small Harvard research lately published under the title "University Administration." He is quite wrong in thinking that there is any common or prevailing "present system of administration" among American universities. There is wide difference between the administrations of Harvard and Columbia, or Yale and Princeton for example. His idea that the Trustees and Faculty of a university might and should form and announce a policy "for the

¹ Stewart Paton: "University Administration and University Ideals"; *Science*, N. S., xxxiv, 693 (1911).

development of the institution," something which could be fairly called a "general plan," shows that he has failed to comprehend the mode of development of the progressive American universities. Harvard illustrates perfectly the real and the only possible way of growth, answering to perceived public needs. The Scientific School (1846-47) resulted from new industrial needs in New England; the reform in the Medical School (1870) from the perception of new possibilities for the medical profession; the reform in the Divinity School from the conviction that the University's theological department must either die or be made undenominational, a slowly developed conviction; and the introduction of instruction in architecture from the fact that architecture had become a congenial and profitable profession for liberally educated Americans. The same is true of the expansion of Harvard to meet needs of the community in regard to music, history, economics, government, forestry, biology, archeology, comparative religion, etc. No mortal could have "planned" the successive advents of these new subjects, and announced a policy concerning them. The direction of growth of a live American university is determined by the new needs of our democratic community seen and understood by some farsighted persons in the active administration. The growth is not initiative but responsive.¹

¹ Eliot might have added to his list of cases that of the Graduate School of Business Administration which originated in his time, partly because it was supposed, after the Spanish War, that young Americans would have to be trained for colonial administration and foreign trade, partly because Eliot and others were impressed by the large proportion of the graduates of the

Even in regard to the layout of grounds and buildings it has proved impossible at Harvard and every other growing university to make a layout for years to come and adhere to it. Three layouts were made for the Harvard territory in Cambridge by as many good architects in my time, but the Corporation found it impossible to adhere to any one of them except in a general way. In a few years unimagined needs, new resources, and changes in the public taste will make any such layout obsolete except in its broadest features. Dr. Paton's article contains many just remarks, but his main propositions are far from correct....

To A. T. Lyman

May 10, 1912

... Your account of the Lawrence strike interested me very much. It began with violence against persons and property; it was supported from without by anarchists, philosophic socialists, and socialistic philanthropists — the usual assortment —; property was protected by the state; but finally the manufacturers broke, and the strikers gained most of what they expected to gain. Pretty soon they will try the same game again, not in the same mills or city, but in the textile industry somewhere else. Why shouldn't they? Their logic is sound. To their

College who were going into business. If he had mentioned the Graduate School of Education he would have pointed to a department that was indebted for its beginnings to him more than to anybody and which was therefore not the best of examples to cite in support of his criticism of Dr. Paton's paper.

minds, the results of the Lawrence strike were well worth the temporary suffering and loss to them — the strikers. Their sympathizers tell them that they are terribly oppressed, and incite them to forcible resistance; and on the other hand the owners and managers succumb in a way that tends to make people believe that the business would all along have borne higher wages to the operatives.... I see but two remedies for the industrial warfare now going on in all countries which use the factory system and modern means of transportation — one is the Canadian Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (opposed by both capitalists and labor-men in Mass. two years ago), and the other is the enlistment of men and women in those industries which, like coal-mining and transportation, deal with necessities of life, on terms resembling those on which men enlist in the army or navy but much less severe.

No strikes, boycotts, or union labels should be allowed.

The right place to try such an enlistment method is the great railroad...

A presidential election was an event of unfailing interest to Eliot. From 1884 until 1916 he made a "public" declaration of his own position in advance of each election. The next letter, written from a steamer on the Pacific, shows that while he was still in the East he began to think about how he should vote in 1912.

To Miss Leslie Hopkinson

Aug. 1, 1912

DEAR LESLIE, — ... With your help I have been reading up the conventions and the comments thereon. The current discussion seems to me a very useful one, and we may hope that it will lead to such an extension of civil service reform that the party in power will no longer be able to use office-holders to manage the machines, committees, and conventions by means of which they prolong their power. Roosevelt has hold of a fact when he says that the machines have robbed the people of power which belongs to them; but he ought not to be so hot about it, or to try to make people believe that the Taft machine has any new and worse tricks than its predecessors. Nobody has ever made more brazen and effective use of officeholders and ex-officeholders to control committees and conventions than Roosevelt. It has been the custom in the Republican party for many years; and the Democrats have been just as bad whenever they have been in power. Roosevelt followed the custom whenever he needed to. Up to this moment, I feel the following objections to Roosevelt as a candidate: — (1) His opposition to the arbitration treaties was unreasonable and pernicious; (2) his treatment of Taft for a year past has not been such as one gentleman should give another; (3) he was in no position to split the Republican party on the grounds he has alleged; because he has been an active participant in the sort of wrong-doing which he now denounces so violently; (4) he is responsible for the great fall in manners

which marks the present presidential campaign; (5) his egotism, self-confidence, and personal ambition overwhelm his judgment and even his benevolence.

If I am wrong on any of these points, tell me so by letter to Asticou. We are coming home in good order, and feel close by — ten days now from Boston. Love to your mother from us both. Affectionately, C. W. E.

As the foregoing would lead one to expect, Eliot voted for Wilson in November. He also came out for him, before the election, in an open letter to the "New York Times." (Issue of Sept. 24, 1912.) Though he was one of the numerous supporters of the Democratic ticket to whom Woodrow Wilson was personally unattractive,¹ his relations with him in educational work had been on the whole sympathetic and he found himself supporting Wilson's main policies heartily. Before the President-elect was inaugurated the two men met, by Wilson's request, in New York; and Eliot was invited to accept the post of Ambassador to Japan.

To Woodrow Wilson

Jan. 27, 1913

DEAR GOVERNOR WILSON, — I have consulted my wife, my son, and my surviving sister (now eighty-five) on the proposal you made to me last Friday afternoon. They unanimously advise against it, and have presented argu-

¹ A published statement in which this may easily be read between the lines is "The Voter's Choice in the Coming Elections," *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct., 1920.

ments which convince me that I ought not to accept, at my age, the important work to which you invite me. They saw clearly that the service would be highly honorable, and possibly highly useful; but they urged that I had plenty of such work to do at home, and that home was the best and most appropriate working-place for me. I find their arguments just, and so I accept their conclusion, and respectfully decline your invitation, though I thank you for the confidence in me which your giving it implies.

I have not mentioned the subject except to the persons named above; and neither they nor I will make further mention of it.

I am, with high regard, Sincerely yours,...

After the Inauguration — on March 19th, to be exact — President Wilson telegraphed, "Venture to inquire whether you would be willing to consider the appointment as ambassador to Great Britain. It would give me great gratification if I felt that you would." The British Embassy would not have taken Eliot so far from home as the one in Tokyo, and would have been more agreeable; but he had already refused when President Taft offered it to him, for reasons that are given in the letter that follows; and now there was an added and a definite obstacle in the person of the new Secretary of State. For Mr. Bryan Eliot felt no respect at all, and the thought of serving under him was thoroughly distasteful. So he telegraphed back — "I thank you sincerely but still believe I had better work in familiar fields the rest of my life."

To Pres. Richard Henry Jesse

March 28, 1913

DEAR DR. JESSE, — It was a great honor to be offered the ambassadorship to Great Britain by two successive Presidents belonging to two different political parties,¹ and I take it as another indication that for a good many years past there has been no real issue on which thinking Americans have divided into Democrats and Republicans. Perhaps that is the reason why Mr. Roosevelt has felt it necessary to start a new party on new, or freshly borrowed, issues.

I did not decline the ambassadorship because I was old, or because I was not rich. I daresay I could have done the work, and I am sure that I could have maintained a comfortable dwelling and exercised due hospitality in a plain way; but I decided four years ago that diplomatic life had no attractions for me or for Mrs. Eliot, and that my mental habits were not suitable for a modern diplomat, who in these days is really always sitting at the end of a telephone wire. So I told Mr. Wilson I thought I could be of more service at home, working in familiar fields, than I could be abroad.

Thanking you for your good wishes and cordially reciprocating them, I am, Sincerely yours,...

To Jerome D. Greene

April 3, 1913

I have not been able to get up any interest in the proposed celebration of the hundredth anniversary of peace

¹ To A. W. Long, April 10, 1916, Eliot quotes Rhodes — "A unique case."

among English-speaking peoples. In the first place, the signing of the Treaty of Ghent is not the right thing to celebrate. The important fact was the Convention of 1817 about vessels of war on the Great Lakes. In the next place, none of the proposed methods of celebration seems to me satisfactory. Why should we spend large sums of money in erecting a statue of Queen Victoria in Washington and of George Washington in Westminster Abbey, when neither of these personages had anything whatever to do with either the Treaty of Ghent or the Convention of 1817? The right way to celebrate one hundred years of peace between England and the United States is to repeal the exemption of American coastwise vessels from the payment of Panama Canal tolls, and to come to an agreement with England and a few other nations for the maintenance of a permanent court of arbitral justice. Till we do both these things I am opposed to spending any money at all on a celebration of the signing of the Treaty of Ghent. Indeed, I think it inexpedient to have any peace celebration whatever in which Great Britain is to take part, until that Power has withdrawn its objection to the exemption from capture of private property at sea.

That hundred-thousand-dollar fund for preliminary and administrative expenses confirms me in my objection to the whole proceeding, the "formidable" names to the contrary, notwithstanding. In 1917, I should think it appropriate to have one public meeting in Washington and one at Buffalo to celebrate the signing of the Convention of 1817. Affectionately yours, . . .

To A. V. Dicey

Oct. 21, 1913

MY DEAR DICEY, — I am delighted to learn from your good letter of October 8th that you are writing a suitable introduction to a reprint of your "Law and Opinion." The changes in both law and opinion which have taken place since the twentieth century opened are, as you say, very great, and are all in the direction of aggressive collectivism. In this country there certainly has been an extraordinary change in public opinion in favor of collective action, and the change in legislation seems to be greater than the change in opinion. Our state legislatures have been adopting ill-considered statutes of socialistic tendency; and your Parliament has been rasher than any of our legislatures in the same direction. In both countries it is the industrial warfare which presents the most formidable problems to government and to society at large. It seems to me that the wages system, which was an immense improvement on slavery, has come to its limit of service; and that some supplement to wages must now be contrived.

The last two or three years I have been much interested in various profit-sharing schemes which have come into use. Many experiments on that subject have been tried, and the negative results of the experimentation have been quite as useful as the positive. We have proved in this country that no profit-sharing scheme will work which proposes that losses be also shared, or which depends on operatives buying stock in the corporation they

serve. We have learnt that even good pension systems will not prevent strikes and accompanying violence. Universal elementary education does not seem to tend towards industrial peace, but rather the contrary. So far as I can see, the only way is to present to the operative or workman exactly the same motive which energizes the owner or capitalist, namely, the expectation of an increasing revenue as a consequence of zeal, industry, and the avoidance of wastes. I lately described a profit-sharing scheme in a small privately-owned factory in Cambridgeport, which for twelve years has produced in practice the moral effects which theory promised. I am sending you a copy of my article under this cover.¹

It interests me to have you say that physical science and medicine seem to you now the subjects of greatest importance and interest. I believe you sympathize with Bryce in cordially hating Herbert Spencer and all his works; but you are now expressing strongly a Spencerian sentiment. I have long been of your present mind, and it is one of my great satisfactions in looking back on my work as President of Harvard that I succeeded in bringing about, with the help of other men of like mind, great improvements in medical education. For the last four years, that is, since I resigned, I have been maintaining before teachers' associations and clubs that the linguistic, metaphysical, and "even the historical branches of knowledge" should not now hold in education the place they have long occupied.

¹ "Successful Profit-Sharing." *System*, Aug., 1913, pp. 139-45.

You say that not even Bentham could now believe that legislation was the subject to which a man who wished to be serviceable in his time should by preference devote himself. That is emphatically true at present in this country. Political work lags twenty-five or even fifty years behind the sound thinking of the present day. Thus, our Congress has just had a great struggle over tariff questions which had been fully thought out by political economists forty years ago, and is now engaged on a currency bill which is likely to set at defiance financial principles which have been established for the last thirty years in the practice not only of several European nations but of Canada. American legislation is quite sure to be second-hand, belated, imitative work; besides, both in England and in America legislation has to be carried in practice by a political party, and party action is slow, tends to compromises, and is very discouraging and disappointing to the political philosopher or serious student.

Bryce is apparently pursuing at home his usual very active life. He has been travelling and reporting the results of travel so long that he may not find it pleasant or even feasible to sit down in his study and do a long piece of quiet work; but on the other hand, he has such excellent out-of-door habits and interests that he may yet be good for consecutive labor. I hope with you that he will take time to put into shape the knowledge he has accumulated about the democracies of the world. For that purpose he will not need public station, or even present recognition.... Sincerely yours,...

To A. T. Lyman

Oct. 23, 1913

DEAR ARTHUR, — One of the merits of the profit-sharing system in the Simplex Wire and Cable Company is, that it has worked successfully when profits were large and when profits were small. Of course any profit-sharing scheme must be in suspense when there are no profits. Many of the experiments in profit-sharing have failed, because the owners undertook to make their operatives share losses as well as profits — which is of course absolutely impracticable.

Another respect in which the Simplex experiment is interesting is, that the operatives in the works are very mixed racially, and mostly derived from what we speak of as the undesirable races, such as Poles, Lithuanians, South Italians, Syrians, and Greeks. The method has worked well with these races.

Thirdly, the operatives in the works, as in cotton mills, are not inclined to be stable. Only three-fifths of the operatives were profit-sharers last year. The rest had not been long enough in the works to become profit-sharers. One of the advantages of the system is, that all the profit-sharers become interested in making the workmen who are not profit-sharers do a fair and careful day's work.

Many experiments heretofore made in profit-sharing have failed for some one of three reasons: — (1) the owners undertook to make their operatives share losses as well as profits; (2) the amount of the dividend to the profit-sharer was not large enough in proportion to the sum of

their wages for the year. This share ought to amount on the average of years to from one-seventh to one-sixth of the year's wages. Thirdly, the attempt has often been made to make the operatives take their profits in shares of the company's stock, and not in cash. All such attempts ought to have failed, for they had no sound basis in human nature.

The last paragraph in your letter strikes me as too despairing. Is it not clear that the present wage-system cannot possibly lead to industrial peace. Both capital and labor are now highly organized, and are in constant strife. Truces are effected through compromises in which labor nearly always wins a fraction of its last demands; but there is no peace under the wage-system, and given democracy, there will not be. Therefore it is indispensable to invent some supplement to the wage-system in all the factory, mine, and transportation industries. A well-managed cotton-mill in Massachusetts looks to me like a good place in which to try an intelligent experiment. So does a street-railway company in Massachusetts.

Grace was reading me a day or two ago an extract from a letter of her father, written shortly after he went to live in Lowell as a young lawyer at some time in the 1830s. He described the aspect of the factory-girls of that day who often worked in the mills from 5 A.M. to 7 P.M., with recesses which amounted to an hour. He pointed out how destructive the method was to the health and vitality of the girls. This was the Lucy Larcom time. I lately saw almost the same thing in Japan, where mills run continu-

ously night and day, and there are two shifts, each of twelve hours.

There have been enormous improvements made in the management of the cotton industry during the last eighty years, all of which should encourage us to hope that further improvement can be effected, provided we can discover the necessary supplement to the wage-system.

Affectionately yours,...

The next, as the reader will readily perceive, was an acknowledgment of congratulations on his eightieth birthday.

To James Ford Rhodes

March 25, 1914

My eighty years are satisfactory in the retrospect; although I and mine have had a full share of trials and sorrows. The future does not much engage my thoughts, except that I hope life may not outlast working power. Looking back I perceive that I have, for the most part, lived in the work of the passing day, neither regretting the past nor fearing the future, but trying in the passing moment to gain good ends which were often immediate, but sometimes far distant.

Your historic instances remind me that it is a decided advantage to live to be old, so far as influence on later generations goes. None of the men you mention lived to be old. People will listen more readily to an old man, who has something to say to them, than they would to a young

man who spoke, or wrote just as well. An old man is out of the competition, and is, on that account, recognized as an impartial adviser.

So far as I know, such powers of expression as I possess are the result of practice in trying to put my thoughts into terse language and logical order. As president of Harvard University I had good practice in trying to discern and state the compact substance of communications I received from other people; and that was excellent training. As to "style" I think most teachers and critics of English literature would tell you that I had none; but I think they would also say that I was free from obscurity and affectation.

Excuse the egotism of this reply to your delightful note of March 19th. It inevitably set me thinking about my blessings, motives, and doings, a contemplation which, fortunately, I seldom have time for. Sincerely yours,...

To Charles Francis Adams

Apr. 26, 1914

DEAR MR. ADAMS: I received your letter of March 26th in due course of mail, but the discussion contained in it was so fundamental that I put off answering it; also the tone of the letter was so sad that I found it difficult to pursue your subject. The discourse you delivered at Columbia, South Carolina, more than a year ago affected me painfully because of its deep sadness, not to say depression.¹ You and I are about the same age and began life

¹ 'Tis Sixty Years Since. Macmillan Co., New York, 1913.

with much the same set of ideas about freedom and democracy. But you have seen reason to abandon the principles and doctrines of our youth, while I have not. So far as I know, my fundamental beliefs are about the same that they were when I was twenty; but I imagine the grounds of my belief to be more solid now than they were then. My fate in this respect seems to me happier than yours; and to my thinking fate is not the right word for it. Your changed beliefs are an outcome of your experience in life, and my unchanged beliefs are the outcome of my experience and observations in life.

I agree with you in regard to the effect of the trades-unions; they destroy individuality and limit freedom; moreover they make it impossible, or rather very difficult, for a man to do his best at his daily work; and they deprive all their members of the satisfaction which comes from doing one's best. I do not agree with you, however, that the unions are responsible for the "armies of the unemployed." In my opinion there are no such armies except occasionally in times of business depression, and even then the armies consist mostly of the disabled and incompetent and the victims of vice.

I do not agree with you in classing together as nostrums the Initiative, the Referendum, and the Recall. The Referendum seems to me in most cases harmless and in some positively useful. The Initiative is so little used that it is unimportant; and the Recall, particularly the recall of judges, seems to me positively mischievous. As a matter of fact, I do not see that the trades-unions originated

them or are responsible for them. At any rate, that was not the case in either Switzerland or Oregon.

With regard to the total influence of the trades-union movement, I agree that it is now "sordid, selfish, and narrow," but if we look back to the first three quarters of the nineteenth century we shall find in their work much which was unselfish, brave, and highly beneficial to the laboring class. They resisted intolerable conditions of work in the factory system at great cost to themselves and with good results for society at large. Labor unionism is not to my thinking "incompatible with the continuance of republican institutions," but it is inconsistent with industrial efficiency and with the intelligent "pursuit of happiness" by the laboring class.

You speak with approval of the work I have done in "this most unpopular and ungrateful branch of public education." I have done much work in opposition to labor unionism, and am still doing it, but not in your state of mind on the subject; for I believe that the present principles of labor unionists can be modified, and indeed are being modified much for the better; and I think I see a way out of the industrial strife. That way out is profit sharing or co-operative management.

Probably because my body is still available for mental work and many physical enjoyments, I do not suffer that sense of weariness of which you complain. It may come to-morrow, because health and strength may suddenly fail, but till it comes I expect to find pleasure in warring with evil. On the whole, in spite of your question,

“Why should life all labor be?” I am inclined to think that you, too, still enjoy work and conflict. I hope you do. Sincerely yours,...

The angle of divergence between the views of these public-spirited lovers of their country was a wide one. Indeed they were so often headed in opposite directions that their meetings frequently resembled collisions rather than happy junctures. And yet there was a cordiality — and, certainly for the audience, something festive — about their encounters on occasions like meetings of the Board of Overseers; for both men seemed to enjoy, not ungratefully one suspected, an opportunity to indulge their combative impulses against so hard-hitting and therefore so congenial an opponent as was presented to each by the other. Adams roused Eliot to his best efforts. He loved a paradox or a startling hypothesis for its own sweet sake, and never seemed to be in better vein than when he was maintaining an unbefriended thesis by surprising arguments and extravagant assertions. He was as ready to cry woe! woe! to his generation as the President was eager to discover “solid grounds for satisfaction or hope” in the most gloomy situation. Although Eliot could recognize in a general way that these were peculiarities of the other’s thought, he was certain to take Adams quite literally on any particular occasion. In this correspondence, Adams’s reply to the foregoing letter showed that he was surprised by the way he had been interpreted. It remains true, however, that the pessimism of his last years, like that of

his brothers Henry and Brooks, impressed Eliot unpleasantly.

To Jerome D. Greene

July 2, 1900

... From what journal, or newspaper, was the clipping you sent me — “Are the thinking classes always Unitarian?” — taken? So far as I am concerned, the main criticism contained in the article is just. I know I am in the habit of thinking that members of other Christian denominations cannot think much, or reason much, about the dogmas they accept; and when I encounter their defensive arguments they always seem to me weak and archaic. I have not here the article in the “Christian Register”; but the sentiments I seem to have expressed therein are natural to me, and make me fairly liable to the criticism of the clipping, namely, that I believe the Unitarians to be the only thinking, reasoning, and independent religionists. My papers on “The Religion of the Future” and “Twentieth Century Christianity” must be full of that Unitarian assumption.

Affectionately yours,...

To the Same

ASTICOU, Oct. 3, 1914

The weather here is superb; and all outdoor occupations very enjoyable. Mrs. Eliot and I walked up the Little Harbor Brook Trail yesterday afternoon, turned westward when we reached the trail to Jordan's Pond,

and returned over Asticou. The beauty of the walk was enhanced by the variety of colored foliage which appeared on the way. We started too late; so that the sun had set when we reached the top of Asticou going home; and it took us nearly an hour to get safely home from the top of the hill to our door, for, in spite of a splendid moon, it got dark under the trees. We have not had such enjoyable weather all summer as that we have had since the middle of September. We are proposing to get to Cambridge by the evening of Saturday, the tenth — weather permitting. Thereafter, we shall attend very little to the weather and the sky for eight months. About the only weather question we ask during that period is — must I take an umbrella or wear rubbers? or go in the closed carriage, instead of the open? This is a great loss of interest and enjoyment. The fact is that modern life in cities does not deserve to be called life at all. The human body can not be adequately cared for in cities; and the human spirit is often — not always — coarsened or starved. Fortunately, there are many admirable exceptions to this rule, numerous enough to make us hope that the finest types of human being are going to be produced in the future as they have often been in the past, by a combination of city life with country life. Affectionately yours,...

The walk which the preceding letter described was about four and a half miles long and included a climb up the side of Asticou Mountain, so called. Another letter, written from Cambridge the preceding autumn, men-

tioned a six-mile bicycle ride which Eliot and Mrs. Eliot had taken before breakfast.¹

To Owen Wister

Dec. 10, 1914

I now feel safe about that inscription for the Music Building. If you cannot improve it, I shall feel a reasonable confidence that nobody can. I agree with you that Richard Strauss will not supplant Beethoven or Mozart. It seems to me that Beethoven will have a surer and more universal immortality than any other Fine Arts man that has ever lived.

What I meant to say to the Overseers about external distinctions for scholarship, as compared with H's, hat bands, parades, and Stadium or Bowl shoutings for athletes, was this: the Senior who rows a good race, or plays a good game of football or baseball, has reached the climax of his life in that sort of competition. Thereafter, he can never again be so distinguished and admirable a person in that line of human effort. He may immediately sport his hat band or his button, not only with pride, but with prudence; and he may even sport it in after life, on appropriate occasions, when he is old and infirm, as public evidence that at the appropriate time of his life he reached a climax of physical attainment. Last June, I saw a learned Massachusetts Judge, wrinkled and somewhat shrunken, and a white-bearded minister, who never walks at a rate exceeding two and a half miles an hour,

¹ To Francis Rawle, Oct. 31, 1913.

both sporting a Harvard baseball hat band. Their acquaintances who recognized the ribbon laughed with them, but not at them. The badge was the external mark and record of a high degree of excellence achieved at a time of life when that sort of excellence reaches its maximum.

The college scholar who passes a good examination, or series of good examinations, and thereby obtains a Scholarship or Honors, has reached no climax of intellectual power. It is impossible that he should; because that kind of power — unlike athletic force — should increase in the individual with lapse of years; and its complete fruition should arrive at forty, fifty, or sixty years of age, and not at twenty-two. He is only a young man who gives promise in youth of attaining in his prime to a high degree of intellectual distinction. For him to wear a badge or a peculiar garment would be imprudent, as well as boastful. The youth who is really ambitious of intellectual distinction will not exhibit or proclaim evidences of juvenile success during his period of training. He and his friends will be heartily glad of such successes, but he will not be disposed to make public display of them.

The English practice of keeping in the annual catalogue for a long period of years the names of prize-winners and Honor men has merit; because it gives continuous evidence of the value of a university training, and enables later generations to see to what extent, or in how many cases, youthful promise was fulfilled, and in how many cases it was not fulfilled. Such statistics, on the whole, en-

courage a youthful ambition for intellectual excellence. I am glad that this English practice is to be imitated, with the necessary modifications, in the forthcoming Quinquennial [Catalogue of Harvard Graduates].

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. ELIOT

CHAPTER XVI

1914-1920

A bundle of letters, mostly to Lord Bryce

Written during the World War

ELIOT's acquaintance with James Bryce (Viscount Bryce from January, 1914) had begun, as the reader will recall, in 1870. Confidence and sympathy had ripened rapidly, and by this time their friendship had long been precious to both. As correspondents the two busy men usually took more for granted than they put on paper, and few of Eliot's letters written before 1914, at any rate of those that have fallen into my hands, have lent themselves remuneratively to quotation. But after the outbreak of the World War, Eliot wrote more copiously. That cataclysm and what, from the very beginning, it did to the neutral countries, made more acute than ever before certain problems of adjustment between labor and capital about which he had felt concerned during the previous years; and it gave a poignant significance to the achievements and weaknesses of democratic government; which, for half a century, Bryce had been studying and Eliot had been observing with deepening interest. Bryce, in England, was in the midst of the war, and Eliot evidently found satisfaction in exchanging reflections with him and in sending him reports on the condition of affairs in the United States. It thus becomes possible to make a short

chapter of extracts from letters written to Lord Bryce from 1914 onward, and by means of these to supply the reader with clues to Eliot's position on certain issues of the hour. If some of them include bits of merely personal news, the reader will not regret it.

The first letter to be quoted recurs to the subject of Charles Francis Adams's despondency about liberty and progress. It then refers to Eliot's early morning bicycle rides. At this date he was in his eighty-first year. Mrs. Eliot, who regularly rode or walked with him before breakfast, was seventy-six. His correspondent was nearly seventy-six, and Adams, who had, truly, often been engaged in large financial affairs, but who had devoted himself to much else beside money-getting, was turning seventy-nine. The "Hearty" referred to in the second letter had replaced the old "Sunshine" several years before.

To Lord Bryce

April 29, 1914

... Poor old Charles Francis Adams! He says that he and I started in life with pretty much the same opinions and hopes, but that he has seen the futility of our youthful ideas about liberty and progress, and now feels the need of recalling and apologizing for the theories of his youth. He asks of the world now only that he may be let alone, and be allowed to retire from its futile clamors and struggles. I am not at all in his state of mind, probably because my digestive apparatus works better than his does,

or perhaps because my life has been filled with work which had no reference to money getting; whereas a large part of his has had to do with corporations which tried to make money and did not succeed.

Grace sends her love to you and your wife. We have both been well through the winter, but are now complaining a good deal about our cold and wet spring. Our tulips are not in good flower yet, and we have had but few bicycle rides, because of snow, rain, and mud. This morning we had to walk before breakfast instead of riding our wheels. We hope you will find this letter on your safe return home from Palestine. Doubtless you will have received a fresh impression there of the extreme radicalism of Jesus. He made the Priest and the Levite "pass by on the other side," and figured the Samaritan — the Jews had no dealing with the Samaritans — as the ideal neighbor. Affectionately yours,...

ASTICOU, *July 28, 1914*

DEAR BRYCE — Your delightful letter of July 14th reached us last evening; and Grace was much pleased to read it aloud to me.

I value highly the honor of election as Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy, and thank you heartily for getting it for me.

We are having a very interesting and I think profitable political season in the United States. Wilson's refusal to intervene by force of arms in Mexico for the protection of American lives and investments seems to me the best

thing that has been done for the peace of the world by any government — ancient or modern. I have just written an article on that achievement, and some other related acts of his Administration, but I do not know when it is to be published.¹ I will send you a copy as soon as it appears. The Republicans are just issuing their programmes concerning the November elections; and [Samuel S.] McCall printed last week his announcement as candidate for Governor in Massachusetts. He proposes to rely on National issues almost entirely, the chief of which is Protection. They will argue that the consumer has received no benefit whatever from the reduction of the tariff, and that the cost of living is higher than ever. Roosevelt is in bad condition; and the Progressive party will not hold many of the Republican voters who were drawn away from their own party two years ago; hence the Democrats may lose control of the House, or the Senate, or indeed of both. The conduct of the Administration towards business has alienated large numbers of business men, unjustly in the main. Yesterday I sent a letter to Houston, the Secretary of Agriculture, whom I know well, mentioning several acts of the Administration which, in my view, have exasperated business men, and were unnecessary to the carrying out of the anti-monopoly ideas of the Administration — ideas which I hold to be good. The public discussion preceding the election is sure to be active and interesting, and I hope

¹ "Some Contributions of President Wilson's Administration to International Policies and Conduct." *Harper's Weekly*, Aug. 22, 1914.

instructive to large bodies of people, as our Presidential and Congressional elections are apt to be....

We are enjoying to the full the woods and waters of Mount Desert, and the fine walks and drives, but wish that you were enjoying them with us. Fifteen of us went to Baker's Island together last Friday in the "Hearty" and lunched on the outer side of the Island. Yesterday ten of us lunched at Ship Harbor, a charming spot near Bass Harbor Head. In July, our house has been fairly full, and it will be in August; but in September we shall have plenty of room for you. Why not take your vacation over here, since the voyage is not disagreeable to either of you? Affectionately yours,...

References to the World War now became frequent. Between August and the end of 1914, Eliot expressed himself on the subject in about a dozen articles and communications to the press.¹

Looking behind the immediate pretexts, such as the Austrian ultimatum, he thought the war was attributable to the autocratic form of government of which the Central Powers were the vigorous exemplars, and to evils which he believed that form of government naturally fosters and encourages; i.e., the idea that might is right and that the greatness of a state lies ultimately in its military strength; the consequent logical relegation of treaties and contractual obligations to a subordinate category of values; the development of militarism and standing armies and

¹ See "Bibliography, 1914-1924," in *A Late Harvest*.

of bureaucracies and diplomatic corps organized to function secretly in the service of the autocracies. In addition to these causes he recognized a prevalent European fear of sudden invasion of territory and of hostile interference with essential commerce. In searching for an end of the war and a means of reducing the danger of future wars, he admitted freely that a particular war might yield benefits greater than its cost to one or both belligerents; and furthermore that, in the case of a particular country, war might be preferable to non-resistance. He was therefore not a non-resister nor an out-and-out pacifist. A decisive defeat of the Central Powers struck him as being essential to the establishment of a better world order.

He hoped that before the war was over it would provide a demonstration from which democratic societies might gain in prestige, and that it might end to the discredit of autocracy; also, that it might bring the world to the adoption of international agreements that would diminish the danger of sudden invasion and of interference with neutral and private property upon the seas. He hoped that an international court might have an international police force placed at its disposal, and that professional standing armies might give place to armies trained according to the Swiss system.

Although he held firmly to the idea that an international police force would be essential to the effectiveness of an international tribunal, he never worked out anything that could be called a definite project for such a force, and when the League of Nations was conceived

in terms which did not provide for a police force he accepted the Covenant as a step in the right direction and advocated the entry of the United States into the League.

The paper referred to in the first sentence of the next letter must have been one that was published in the "New York Times" for November 17, 1914,¹ and was later republished as Chapter IX of "The Road Toward Peace." Eliot believed, and argued, that free or self-governing peoples are inevitably led to attach greater importance to the sanctity of contract, not only for business purposes, but for political purposes, than do people who live under a more or less despotic form of government.²

To Lord Bryce

CAMBRIDGE, Dec. 17, 1914

I enclose a copy of my last published letter on the War, which I think states clearly my entire view about the real causes of the War. British commercial jealousy of Germany was certainly no real cause; although I had many opportunities to see in the Far East, two and a half years ago, that there was a strong feeling among British merchants in the East about the intrusion of the admirable German liners on the oceans of the Far East.

Have not the events of the last five months proved that the English Tories and Jingoës in Great Britain were right

¹ "The Sources and the Outcome of the European War."

² See his essay called "National Efficiency Best Developed Under Free Government"; Neilson, 388, 394.

in their belief that Germany regarded Great Britain as her real enemy, — the chief Power to be subdued before Germany could attain to her desired World-Empire? It seems to me also that the present state of mind of the entire leading class in Germany — both civil and military — proves that the English Liberals were wrong in believing “The Emperor and the German Nation as a whole to be pacific.” As I say in the enclosed letter, the violation of Belgian neutrality was rather the occasion for Great Britain’s going to war than the real cause. From my point of view, that violation of Belgian neutrality by Germany was a very fortunate happening for the cause of freedom and democracy; because it consolidated British opinion in favor of immediate war. It was, nevertheless, not a real cause of the War. It certainly was a most extraordinary display on the part of Germany of rashness, insolence, and lack of intelligence. The Germans seem to be demonstrating that neither peace nor civilization will be safe, if a nation of their temper, and their lack of experience of freedom, establishes itself as the dominating Power in Europe. The War seems to me to be a struggle between despotic governments and free governments, between democracy and oligarchy, between people that observe agreements or contracts and people that do not.

You will see in the printed letter that I cannot help thinking that Great Britain needs to modify some of her visions and her practices before there can be any assurance of peace in the world. Her conception of Empire

needs modification; and I am afraid it will be hard for her to stop talking about ruling the seas. As a matter of fact, it is a long time since Great Britain ceased to dominate all the oceans of the world; but now she ought to enter into an agreement that neither she nor any other nation shall have leave to dominate the oceans and the seas.

I have been doubtful about the duty of our Government to protest against the violation of agreements made at the Second Hague Conference with regard to mitigations of the horrors of war. The news we had yesterday of the bombardment of unfortified places on the east coast of England by German war vessels tends to prove that no protest on our part, or on the part of any neutral, would avail in the least to induce the Germans to refrain from violating the Hague Conventions. From the beginning, Germany has carried on war in a manner justly described as ruthless. Is not this demonstration of her mental and moral quality in war more advantageous to the cause of ultimate peace than any yielding she could now make to the representations of protesting neutrals?

There will come a time when you as a Gladstone Liberal can help the cause of peace in Europe very much, provided the name "pacifist" does not get fastened on you. I hope, therefore, that you have said, or are going to say in public, the things you say in your letter to me of December 1st about your earlier misjudgment of the German Emperor and people. Otherwise, I fear you will not have the status before English public opinion needed

to make you an influential contributor toward getting out of this horrible War not a truce, but a peace.

I appreciate the fact you mention that an old man, who has retired from the combats which occupied his prime, can exert an influence on public opinion in the community in which he has worked for years which younger men often cannot approach. Is not the reason for this fact the belief of the public that the old man is not only experienced, but disinterested? He is out of the daily struggle for money, influence, or power; so his neighbors in body or in mind think him a man of good will and more impartial than most people.

Mrs. Eliot and I keep well in the main, take our exercise, and sleep well; and we hope that Mrs. Bryce and you are doing the same. Affectionately yours,...

In saying that he had been doubtful about the duty of the American government to protest against the violation of agreements made at the Second Hague Conference, Eliot quite properly refrained from mentioning that he had previously been writing to President Wilson on the subject. First, on August 8, he had sent the President a suggestion that the United States should propose a combination with Great Britain, France, Russia, and Japan to enforce non-intercourse against the Central Powers. This would have accorded with one of the ideas about methods of discouraging aggressive warfare which he had endorsed in his report to the Carnegie Peace Foundation.¹

¹ Pages 16-17. Also in Neilson, 359-61.

It would have entailed the use of the army and navy of the United States as part of a quasi-police force, and would, as he pointed out, have required, as a preliminary, the renouncement by the Allies of any purpose to extend their national territory. This suggestion, which need not be given in full, was sent under cover of the following note.

To President Wilson

Aug. 8, 1914

DEAR PRESIDENT WILSON, — I have hesitated three days to mail the enclosed letter to you, and should still hesitate to forward it while you are overwhelmed with sorrow, did I not recall that under such circumstances there is comfort and relief for the sufferer in resolving that he will thereafter do everything in his power to help other people who are suffering or bereaved.

At this moment millions of men are apprehending death or agonies for themselves or poverty and desolation for their families, and millions of women are dreading the loss of lovers, supporters, and friends; and perhaps you have the power to do something to stop these miseries and prevent their recurrence.

In such an effort you would find real consolation.

With deepest sympathy in your affliction, I am,

Sincerely yours,...

The President acknowledged the note and memorandum on the 14th in a manner that showed that he was

giving consideration to such a possibility. Eliot wrote again on the 20th.

To President Wilson

Aug. 20, 1914

DEAR PRESIDENT WILSON, — In revising a letter I had written you on August 17th, amplifying the proposal contained in my letter of August 6th, I have come to the conclusion that it would not be desirable “to open *pourparlers* by cable on this subject” at the present moment, even if it were feasible. Two considerations have led me to this conclusion: (1) We apparently do not possess full information on the real purposes and objects of either Russia or Germany: at least the thinking American public does not possess this information, and therefore cannot justly fix on Germany the chief responsibility for the present cataclysm. The extreme rashness of Germany’s action cannot but suggest that elements of the situation, still unknown to the rest of the world, were known to her. I do not feel the confidence I then felt in the information accessible when I wrote my letter to you of August 6th. (2) Communications between our Government and the Governments of France and Great Britain, which would necessarily be secret, are undesirable at the present stage of the conflict. Indeed secret diplomacy is always to be disliked, whether used by free governments or despotic. These are sufficient objections to the *pourparlers* I suggested.

I am inclined to give new weight to certain reasons for

holding to our traditional policy of neutrality in conflicts between other nations: (1) It seems probable that Russia, Great Britain, and France together can inflict ultimate defeat on Germany and Austria-Hungary — the only tolerable result of this outrageous war. (2) It seems possible that the seven nations now at war can give the much-needed demonstration that the military machinery which the last half of the nineteenth century created all over Europe cannot be set in motion on a large scale without arresting production to a very dangerous degree and causing an intolerable amount of suffering and misery. The interruption of production and commerce which has already taken place since July 31st is unexampled in the history of the world; and yet the destruction of life and property has hardly begun. If seven nations can give this demonstration, the other nations had better keep out of the conflict.

On reflection, I have also come to think that much public discussion of the interest of free governments in the reformation of the military monarchies of Europe will be necessary before American Public Opinion will sanction forcible opposition to outrages committed by those monarchies on weaker and freer neighbors.

I remain of the opinion that, in the interests of civilization and peace, neither Germany nor Austria-Hungary should be allowed to succeed in its present undertakings.

Your address to your countrymen on the conditions of real neutrality is altogether admirable in both form and substance. Sincerely yours,...

The President's reply, dated the 19th, explained that he had come to the conclusion that such intervention as had first been suggested would not then be possible.¹

To Lord Bryce

June 16, 1915

Through the complete disregard by Germany of all existing rules concerning naval warfare, the nations are learning what the submarine can do for both attack and defence, and, through the neglect by all the combatants of some of the preëxisting rules concerning warfare on land, the world is also learning what aëroplanes and big, high-powered balloons can do towards killing non-combatants and destroying enemy property on land by means of un-aimed bombs dropped from air-machines. These new war processes cannot be prevented during this War; for they are too valuable to the combatants who are willing to use them. All that opponents of war can do now is to realize and recognize the fact that modern warfare will not pay any attention to international law or agreements which have no sanction behind them. The advocacy now or hereafter of international agreements which have no sanction seems to me futile, and, therefore, in the highest degree, inexpedient. Mere insistence on the rights of neutrals will do no good, unless the insistence implies the use of force in defence of the neutrals' rights. I, therefore, find all the projects for making international agreements

¹ Mr. Ray Stannard Baker informs me that he will probably include the President's two letters in the forthcoming volumes of his *Life of Woodrow Wilson*.

after this War is over, without providing a force capable of securing the execution of these agreements, extremely discouraging and, indeed, hopeless....

What I mean by the "open door" is, that all the manufacturing countries should have equal access to markets for their products in all parts of the world; that the ports of each nation should be open on equal terms to the commerce of all other nations; and that the transportation facilities within any given country, like China or Japan, should be open in like manner to all comers. This is not "free-trade," the different countries of the world collecting, as now, whatever duties on entering goods they saw fit to collect; but England, for example, would have no better opportunity to sell its manufactured goods in China than Germany or the United States would have. This policy would content the "protection" nations, just as well as it would Great Britain....

Do your opinions, first, that Europe is very far from "the maintenance of an international naval and military force for the preservation of peace," and secondly, that "an international federal system is not within the range of practical politics," mean that you see no way of getting securities for the future of Europe out of the present horrible convulsion? I cannot bring myself to accept that conclusion; it is too despairing. The deadlock in France seems to me to prove conclusively that defensive warfare is hereafter to have great advantage over aggressive. Again, have not all the nations learnt that war in the future is likely to have its results determined, within

limits, by the industrial and financial resources of a nation, rather than by the number and fighting quality of its population? It is clear that a nation of sixty million can deal with a nation of one hundred and eighty million, and that a nation of ten million can put up a tremendous fight, if it can beg or borrow money and supplies enough. These military results of the present War ought to make for peace in the future; because they tend to make war inconclusive....

July 14, 1915

This is in answer to yours of June 25th and of July 1st.

I notice first that you have lost a nephew in the Dardanelles; and you say that there is not a household that is not so suffering. That is just the way it was in New England during the Civil War; and it went on with us for four years. The striking thing now is that there is no vivid memory of those sufferings to-day in the public mind. The persons who went through that suffering are old, and many things have happened since; and the two later generations that are now on the stage have no impressions about the sacrifices of war which are effective to deter them from going to war again. On the contrary, all the praises lavished on the heroes of the Civil War tend to incite the new generation to like deeds. A large number of young Harvard men — partly single, but many married — are voluntarily going into camp at this moment, to learn in six weeks something about the duties of a military officer, thinking that war with Germany is to come.

Your skepticism as to the moral effect of war on some of the soldiers and many of the non-combatant population is justified. During our Civil War we witnessed a deal of selfishness and greed among the people who made or traded in war materials. We also saw the moral damage which a population suffers which is compelled to use paper money. In our Revolutionary War the same demoralizing things appeared in great force; and nobody pointed them out more clearly than Washington, or knew more about them. Indeed, both as General commanding and as private citizen he suffered from them keenly.

We are living here our usual delightful life by the sea and the hills, except that every mail brings grievous news of personal and public war calamities. This is a dark shadow over all the beauties of sky, sea, and hill. Affectionately yours,...

Aug. 26, 1915

Your letter of August 8th brings up the fundamental question — will Great Britain assent to an international guarantee of the freedom of the seas, instead of trying to maintain by her own single strength a freedom of the seas adequate for her own defense and her own commercial and industrial welfare? You say that Great Britain would have to be *completely* satisfied that the international guarantee was one upon which she could rely. You say that Great Britain must not be exposed to *any* risk of invasion. To my thinking, *complete* satisfaction and

the removal of *every* risk are unattainable in the world of to-day, considering the immense development of means of communication, and of transportation on both land and water. Great Britain and all the other nations, which love liberty and desire peace, ought to consider what international arrangements will afford the *best chance* for freedom of the seas and international peace; and the only wisdom is to pursue that policy or that course of action which will afford the best chance — positive assurance being unattainable by any course of action in being or imaginable.

To us Americans, looking at the events of the past year and some previous events from a distance which gives us a just perspective, and enjoying comparative calm and freedom from distorting anxiety and immediate apprehension, it seems quite clear that Great Britain's navy alone, without great land forces — British or other — *cannot*, as a matter of fact, secure for Great Britain and her natural allies an adequate freedom of the seas or exemption from invasion, no matter how great an additional burden Great Britain and her federated commonwealths may be willing to attempt to bear. Navies alone cannot prevent outbreaks of aggressive warfare in Europe and Asia. Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey combined have access by land to Belgium, Holland, and France on the one side, and to the Balkan States, the Near East, and the Far East on the other. The same powers in combination can attack Russia successfully without any use of the seas. In 1898 the United States

could bring nothing significant to pass against feeble Spain, until land forces were put into Cuba. The navy of the United States could do nothing with the Filipinos; land troops were necessary. Detachments from the navies of Great Britain, France, Germany, the United States, and Japan could not deal effectually with the Boxer Insurrection, until these nations put land troops at work in China. The expedition of Admiral Seymour from Tientsin to Peking was driven back; and an international army had to be put into the field. In the War between Russia and Japan nothing was settled by Japan's great victory in the Sea of Japan, except that Japan's land troops could thereafter be safely transported to the continent. In these days of effective mines and submarines, a navy — no matter how powerful — cannot by itself force an important harbor or channel held by a capable enemy; it must have the coöperation of a land force. The security of the German navy at this moment in its own harbors, and the impossibility of opening the Dardanelles by naval force alone illustrate this general truth.

If these premises are correct, the reliance of Great Britain on the two-navies policy is not well-founded; and Great Britain, and the other liberty-loving nations which in recent years have trusted to a British guarantee for the freedom of the seas, ought to look for better securities. Where are they to be found? *Only* in a firm league of the liberty-loving nations made on purpose to secure the freedom of the seas, and to prevent attacks by land or sea on any of its members....

The next letter and passages in others that come after, reflect the fact that Bryce was at work on the completion of his book on "Modern Democracies." American readers will not need to be reminded that a presidential election was at hand in October, 1916, and that the Republican Party had nominated Justice Charles E. Hughes. Eliot published his reasons for believing that President Wilson ought to be reelected, in the "Atlantic Monthly" for October ("Achievements of the Democratic Party") and in a supplementary statement to the "New York Times," "Boston Herald," and "Philadelphia Ledger," which appeared on the 22d of October.

Oct. 4, 1916

I have never said much about the "swing democracy has taken in the U.S. toward direct action by the people." The experiments on that subject have been made by the cruder States of the Union; but so far very little harm has been done. The recall of judges, which Roosevelt favored, was a monstrous proposition which found very little favor. There is no doubt that the politicians grow more and more afraid of any large and well-organized group of voters, like the Federation of Labor, for example. At this moment every bit of paper printed by either the Republican or Democratic Campaign Committees bears the union label, which is one of the most formidable of the labor union weapons in support of union labor monopoly. There is no difference between the two great parties in respect to their truckling to Labor. One party is as

cowardly and unjust as the other. Hughes is at this moment talking as if he would have been more resistant than Wilson was when the four railway brotherhoods came at him; but there is no reason to believe that he would have done any better than what Wilson did. Both Roosevelt and Taft were flabby in dealing with the labor question; but Taft's acts were sounder and more vigorous than Roosevelt's, although Roosevelt had the advantage of Taft in vehement words.

Both Hughes and Wilson are non-resistant on woman suffrage; but Hughes appears to less advantage, because he gives such bad reasons for succumbing — destiny and a violent agitation. They both want the women's votes in those States beyond the Mississippi which have already given the suffrage to women. That was Roosevelt's motive in 1912.

Wilson's idea that a uniform eight-hour day has commended itself to American society as a whole has no foundation. American people are not so foolish as to suppose that there can be any uniform number of hours in the working day for all industries. In some industries, eight are too many; in others, they are too few. Everything depends on the nature of the industry, and the kind of attention and activity it requires from the workers. But then, the railroad managers who had to deal with the threats of the four brotherhoods made an equally bad mistake when they made everything turn on arbitration. Arbitration in the industrial war is really of no use at all toward the settlement of that kind of strife. Arbitration

in international disputes has done a great deal of good by providing just settlements which held and were final. Arbitration in industrial disputes leads to nothing but first a compromise, in which Labor generally gets as much as it expected from the particular body of employers against which it struck. And this compromise is followed by a short truce which suddenly ends without notice in another strike. I have no hope that a democracy will deal safely with the industrial warfare, either through legislatures or through courts. In this respect the British democracy is worse than the American—that is, weaker. The plain fact is that a large part of the laboring population which is not unionized sympathizes with the strikers, at least nine times out of ten, hoping naturally enough that if the union men win their strike the wages of non-union men will also be advanced, or some other gain for laboring people will be brought about. Multitudes of honest workmen feel no active condemnation of the disregard of unions for the contracts they make. I have never heard any condemnation in the public at large for a kind of injustice which unions constantly perpetrate; namely, demanding more wages or shorter hours of an owner or contractor in the middle of a job or contract which he has undertaken, and has promised to finish at a given time, yet that performance is outrageous and thoroughly immoral. The great body of working men rather approve of uniform minimum wages, not seeing how adverse the uniform wage is to the feeble, the partially disabled, and the old. Democratic sympathy goes to the under-dog in

any fight, and the common people conceive that in the fight between Capital and Labor heartless Capital is generally on top. Is not this situation going to be permanent in the democracies? Democratic legislators will be quite sure in time to pass all the laws which Labor wants passed, and to refuse to pass laws to which Labor is opposed. Look at Australia and New Zealand, and see how democracies are likely to handle the incessant conflict between Capital and Labor. You are asking if legislatures and courts cannot be depended on, — what help is there? None, except to teach the great body of consumers steadily that it is unsafe to trust the interests of the community at large to any selfish, grasping, greedy class whether capitalists or laborers. Secondly, business men themselves must organize the great industries in such a way that the workmen in any given factory, shop, or mine must have the same motive that the owner has for making the business of that particular factory, shop, or mine stable, and as highly profitable as possible. Under the names of coöperative management and profit-sharing, there are many promising experiments on this subject now being made in the United States; but I am sorry to say that there are also a large number of unpromising experiments going on, which are sure to fail and bring discredit on both coöperative management and profit-sharing. Some of these experiments are not even honest, and their deceitfulness is easily seen by their victims. Others are highly successful; but the men who make them successful are not interested to describe them

for the benefit of other people, thinking that they have acquired legitimate advantage over their competitors by applying early these new methods of securing thorough coöperation between employers and employed

The moral of this long screed is that Wilson's mode of dealing with the Labor question is not a strong element in the present Presidential campaign. The Republicans will try to make it so; but the result of their endeavors in this direction is more than doubtful....

Be it understood that, in speaking as above about the experiments in coöperative management and profit-sharing, Eliot wrote of something he was taking great pains to look into. For several years he had been collecting information about every genuine experiment in profit-sharing or coöperative management about which he heard. A bundle of correspondence about one case, the Mitten Management Corporation's experiment with the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company, runs to about half a hundred items, not including incidental printed matter. There were many other companies with whose personnel he entered into correspondence.

To Lord Bryce

Nov. 13, 1916

... You intimated in one of your later letters that after all the elected executive, as instituted by the Pilgrims at Plymouth, might not prove a lasting institution or the one most favorable to liberty and civilization. Is not the

answer to this doubt to be found in the success of the American mode of obtaining a chief executive for a term of years? I see in all the world no other method of obtaining a chief executive which has worked as well. This War seems to demonstrate that the method of selection by birth or by divine commission has failed. The democratic nations have today more effective and more righteous executives than the aristocratic monarchical or imperial. Moreover, in the democratic nations the process of selecting the chief executive has improved decidedly since you and I were born. The improvement in the United States is conspicuous. There is more rational argument than formerly, and during this recent campaign less disorder, and apparently no fraud. Steam communication, the telegraph, the telephone, and the Australian ballot have contributed largely to these improvements; but with these material advantages has gone a distinct moral improvement. The Presidential election here is a wonderful piece of education for the whole people. They get by the million training in the determination of facts, the selection of premises, and the drawing of trustworthy conclusions. And then when everybody has voted there comes that admirable submission by the minority to the will of the majority, which distinguishes the English and American democracies from the Central American and South American. I have taken part in fifteen Presidential elections, having missed the second election of Lincoln, and my respect and admiration for the performance have steadily increased. To be sure, I have been on the win-

ning side thirteen times out of fifteen, although I have been an Independent since 1884....

Eliot voted for Cleveland when Harrison won in 1888. The other occasion on which he voted on the losing side was the election of 1856 when Buchanan defeated Fillmore and Frémont. He then voted for the "decent Whig platform" of the Republican Party, although he "thought small potatoes" of their candidates, including, apparently, Fillmore. After 1916 his candidates were unfortunate; he voted for Cox rather than Harding in 1920, and for Davis in 1924.

To Lord Bryce

Jan. 11, 1917

Your remark (30th November) that we have generally secured at least respectable men for our Presidency is, from my point of view, too moderate or inadequate. Among the twenty-three men who have served as President, I count twelve as decidedly able, and eleven who were of respectable ability. Among them all, there is not one who can be fairly called disreputable or discreditable to the voters who placed him at the head of the Government. Do you know any other series of chief national executives of which that much can be said? No such series is visible to me in any other land. As you say, we have had some fortunate escapes, and some of these escapes have been narrow; but nations, like individuals, must be free to make mistakes and to sin if they are to

grow in wisdom and virtue. That freedom is the principal advantage of democratic government.

Some of us are in hopes of improving the situation of the President of the United States through an amendment of the Constitution, making his term six years, at the end of which term he shall not be immediately eligible for reelection. That amendment is now being much discussed in Congress and elsewhere....

Feb. 16, 1917

... I do not see so clearly as you do the decline in the intellectual quality of representative bodies during the past forty years. What I do see is that modern business, including the professions, offers to intelligent and well-educated men, and often to uneducated men of remarkable capacity, careers of usefulness and honor which two generations ago were to be found only in public service. This result has been brought about in the United States by the rise in dignity and influence of the great corporations, as manufacturers, carriers, and financial agents. This development of corporations has had a tremendous effect in this country on the learned and scientific professions, as well as on the ordinary business occupations. For fifty years, I have seen among the graduates of Harvard University this tendency to prefer the service of useful and valuable corporations to the public service; so that I have come to look on corporation service, including educational and charitable corporations, as one of the great bulwarks of democracy. I am sure that these corporations as a whole, including the public Press

corporations, have much more to do with the formation of public opinion in this country than the debates in the American Senates and Houses of Representatives all put together....

The foregoing sentences glance at an idea which Eliot had amplified in other places. As there has been no previous occasion for drawing attention to it, it deserves a further word in this connection. It will perhaps be found as fully expressed in the paper entitled "The Working of the American Democracy,"¹ as anywhere else. He there said, in part:

[An] "exhibition of diffused mental and moral energy has accompanied the establishment and the development of a system of higher instruction in the United States, with no inheritance of monastic endowments, and no gifts from royal or ecclesiastical personages disposing of great resources derived from the state, and with but scanty help from the public purse.... The endowment of institutions of education, including libraries and museums, by private persons in the United States, is a phenomenon without precedent or parallel, and is a legitimate effect of democratic institutions.... There is another direction in which the people of the United States have spent and are now spending a vast amount of intellectual and moral energy — a direction not, as in the three cases just considered, absolutely peculiar to the American republic, but still highly characteristic of democracy.

¹ Address delivered in 1888, printed in *American Contributions to Civilization*.

I mean the service of corporations.... The service of many corporations has become even more important than the service of the several States of the Union. The managers of great companies have trusts reposed in them which are matched only in the highest executive offices of the nation; and they are relatively free from the numerous checks and restrictions under which the highest national officials must always act. The activity of corporations, great and small, penetrates every part of the industrial and social body, and their daily maintenance brings into play more mental and moral force than the maintenance of all the governments on the Continent combined.... In American democratic society corporations supplement the agencies of the state, and their functions have such importance in determining conditions of labor, diffusing comfort and general well-being among millions of people, and utilizing innumerable large streams and little rills of capital, that the upper grades of their service are reached by merit, are filled, as a rule, upon a tenure during good behavior and efficiency, are well paid, and have great dignity and consideration. Of the enormous material benefits which have resulted from the American extension of the principle of incorporation, I need say nothing. I wish only to point out that freedom of incorporation, though no longer exclusively a democratic agency, has given strong support to democratic institutions; and that a great wealth of intellect, energy, and fidelity is devoted to the service of corporations by their officers and directors.”

To Lord Bryce

June 12, 1917

... You have not quite apprehended my view about universal military service. The experience of the Swiss, and now of all the Entente Allies, makes me believe in the expediency and the rightfulness of maintaining in each country a well-prepared and well-supplied army which is first, national, second, unpaid, and third, always on call for service either at home or abroad. The Swiss have shown how all this can be done without serious interference with the national industries or with the national systematic education, and with certain decided physical and moral advantages to the people, and yet without creating in the population any professional military class, except a class of teachers of the successive annual levies, and without creating in the population any militaristic spirit. Of course in every country a small body of scientists would have to be permanently employed in watching for and adopting useful new inventions for military and naval use. It is such armies as these that will need to be maintained for many years after this War ceases in order to hold down Germany and her allies. It is this kind of an army which can be safely maintained by any people for use at home or abroad. It is only this kind of an army which can be maintained by a free people with entire moral satisfaction. How can a real democracy maintain an army at all resembling the old Regular Army of Britain or the present Regular Army of the United States? They were both aristocratic institutions

in a high degree, and they both were officered by men who had no other profession or business except that of arms. That class ought to be abolished in the entire civilized world. We need very much in this country the incidental advantages of the Swiss military constitution. We need a national system of physical training in all our schools; and might get it just as the Swiss do — on national grounds and at small national expenditure. It would be an enormous advantage in our country if we could substitute the Swiss national sport, shooting at a mark, for our national sport, looking on at rough football games and chattering, tricky, baseball games. The existence of such a national force would be the best security that either Britain or the United States could take against the violence and injustice of Labor unions....

We had a small lawn descending from our house with a gentle slope toward the south. It is now planted with vegetables, chiefly potatoes; but the prices of labor by man and beast are so high that I have already demonstrated that it is quite impossible to recover in the crops from the small patch what I have already spent on labor in ploughing, harrowing, manuring, and planting it. From an economic point of view, such expenditures, which are much in favor in Massachusetts at present, seem of dubious advantage. They relieve the feelings, however....

Switzerland's military system based upon physical instruction in the schools, universal military training for

two to three months at the age of twenty, and recurrent annual periods of training for ten days to a fortnight or more until middle life appeared to Eliot to assure such military preparedness as he believed would suffice if the Great Powers could be persuaded to adopt it. A manhood moderately well prepared for service seemed to him preferable to a military establishment of a professional order. It should be less dangerous politically. On the military and political aspects of the matter he presented a more ample argument than this letter contains in "The Advantages of the Swiss System of Military Training" ("National Economic League Quarterly," May, 1917) and in several other communications to the Press.¹ The Swiss system also commended itself to him for educational reasons. The reader will bear in mind that he believed that there should be — and, as always when he so believed, hoped that there would ultimately be — an international force to support an international tribunal.² He had always been a believer in physical training and had often urged that, along with manual training and more education of the senses it should be accorded an honorable place in the schools. America's experience with the draft in 1917 and 1918 disclosed what seemed a deplorably large percentage of physically unfit, and thereupon Eliot appears to have become persuaded

¹ References will be found in the "Bibliography, 1914-1924," in *A Late Harvest*.

² "An International Force must support an International Tribunal," Neilson, 383. (First published, as Leaflet 19 of the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes.)

that physical training ought to be required throughout the country. For the aim of an educational system must be primarily to prepare the youth of the country to live healthful, happy, and productive lives.¹

To Lord Bryce

March 6, 1918

... You ask "whither the world is tending?" It seems to me to be getting divided into three principal groups, the democracies, the autocracies, and the anarchies, the first group expecting to be able to hold the second, and the third helpless for many years to come. My faith that the democracies will ultimately be too much for the autocracies is unshaken; because I believe liberty is the vital air of strong human character....

April 10, 1919

... I am declining all new work, and do not succeed in keeping my old irons hot. My correspondence is hopelessly behind. I have lately discovered that my left eye is no longer good for reading; and I suppose I must take care of my right. Nevertheless I get through a fair amount of work in a day. Perhaps about half as much as I did when I was forty-five....

Sept. 8, 1919

... I sympathize with you strongly as to spending time on sentences you really thought out some time ago; but I have one experience which qualifies my own reluctance

¹ See "Protection against Ignorance," in *A Late Harvest*, at 112. (First published in *The Nation's Business*, Feb., 1921.)

in the same matter, namely, now and then I read a sentence or a page which I wrote years ago, and say to myself, "I could not write that now, this is better than the work I am now doing." I hope you have some similar experiences....

A passage from a letter to Dicey (dated Jan. 25, 1915) must be set beside the foregoing. For, taken together, the two afford a delightful example of the way in which Eliot could manage to find "satisfaction" in whichever side of an alternative he found himself forced to accept. Dicey, working on a new edition of one of his books, evidently lamented its imperfections, and Eliot replied: "Did you expect to be satisfied with it? Have you ever been satisfied with any piece of work you have done? When I read again a piece of work I did years ago, or even weeks ago, I generally say to myself — 'that isn't bad; but it might have been much better.' And, on the whole, it seems to me that the highest satisfaction is attained from the perception that one can now do a better piece of work than he did ten years ago, or ten weeks ago. The best satisfaction is in the perception of gain of power. I hope you have that, not as regards speed in work, but as regards the good sense of your work."

To Lord Bryce

Jan. 6, 1920

... I am very sorry that you find so many of the hopes and expectations of your youth and your prime threat-

ened or forgotten in your age. You were a genuine Liberal, and you have to see the Liberal Party broken, and even disappearing. You believed in German philosophy, thoroughness, and skill in all sorts of research work, and in the applications of methods which other nations had discovered; and you have lived to see a ferocious Prussian philosophy taught to a whole population for fifty years bring about the worst catastrophe that has ever happened to the human race. You were deeply interested forty years ago in the protection and deliverance of the Armenians and other Near East peoples from the Turkish misrule; and you have lived to see half the Armenian race killed off by the same Turkish government, backed by Germany, and again you have to see no help or remedy, saving a totally inadequate charity from over-seas. For these sorrows and trials I see no consolation except active participation in further fighting. That is what I have tried to do all my life, and in certain directions am still doing to the best of my impaired ability....

Feb. 17, 1920

... I enclose what I expect to be my final effort on behalf of ratification of the Covenant and Treaty, an effort made with very little hope that it can succeed.¹ For several months past I have felt so humiliated at the position into which the small group of obstructing Senators have put the American people that I did not feel like writing or

¹ "The Senate Obstructionists' Estimate of the American People." *New York Times*, Feb. 15, 1920. *U.S. Cong. Rec.*, Feb. 17, 1920.

talking in public on the subject. Even now I think my chief object is to put on record my opinion of the American people in the year 1920, the opinion of a man old enough to have been a competent student of the American mind and spirit for ten years before the Civil War, during the four years of that War, for twenty years of commercial and industrial change after the War, the later rapid growth of the country's wealth, the Spanish War with its good result in Cuba and its bad result in the Philippines, the slow growth of American opinion in favor of entering the War in Europe, and the final impetuous rush into that War. This old man, moreover, has been actively concerned with American education of all grades for sixty-five years, and in that work has had unusually good opportunities for learning what the fundamental hopes and ideals of thinking Americans are for their country and for mankind....

What surprises me a bit in your letter is your confidence that you know what Wilson did or did not do at the Paris Conference. We here feel no such confidence. We too find many defects in the Treaty; but we think it better than nothing. I think the Covenant the noblest international agreement yet....

March 9, 1920

... I have been shockingly remiss in not sending back the proof-sheets of your Chapters XX and XXI. Here they are at last with the questions which occurred to me as I read them. I am not sure that I understand just what you are driving at in these two Chapters. Are you pro-

posing to leave them as descriptions from which your readers may draw each his own conclusion, or are they just vivid pictures from which in some other part of the book you propose to draw your own conclusions, and lay down a moral doctrine in respect to both democracy and communism? For example, in Chapter XX you paint the inevitable universal bureaucracy which must accompany the abolition of private property and the assumption of all productive industries by the State. It is a vivid picture, but nowhere in it do you point out that communism carried into execution must destroy in mankind the personal and family motives which have very gradually built up the institution of the family and the ordered state of limited functions. I have tried ever since I began to use such energy and capacity as I possessed to push things in this world up a bit, never to describe evils without making a strong effort to describe the remedies for these evils. On the whole, I believe that to be a sound method....

... Perhaps the American idea of equality in a democracy has been inevitably quite different from that of France or England. We have never been in contact with distinctions founded on birth or inherited privileges of any kind. It was an important object in the French Revolution to get rid of all those things. The English people never have really cared to get rid of inherited privileges of birth or of great estates accompanying great titles. The English democracy, therefore, never has been seeking equality as regards possessions or capacities. It has known

perfectly well that there can exist no such equality; but it on the other hand recognizes to the full those differences between individuals and families which depend on education, capacity, and character. You speak in one place as if the newly rich were in England admitted to equal standing with families in which some wealth has been transmitted for a generation or two. That is not at all the case in America. At least I know no American city or large town in which a newly rich man does not have to make his way to public esteem by years of careful service to the public out of his private means. Two weeks ago I heard a very rich man in Boston, who is potent in manufacturing, banking, and the like, suggested as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. The suggestion was unanimously condemned by the group to which it was made, on the ground that he was newly rich and did not know how to use his money. In short, in America liberty means all that it ever did except that liberty used must not involve another's harm. And brotherhood means as much as ever it did, and gradually takes on a wider range; but equality in the social, industrial, or financial sense has little place....

June 3, 1920

I remain of the opinion that concise expressions of your own opinions about the subjects you discuss in your book on Democracy would add to its influence, both now and hereafter; but doubtless my opinion on the subject is

influenced, perhaps determined, by my own experience in advocating educational reforms. I was always trying to get people to take one more step — it might be a very short one — in the direction which seemed to me the right one: and therefore I was all the time involved in controversies in which I had to take sides. I was after immediate reformatory action, not merely reflection or the patient consideration of existing evils. Take as illustrations of what I mean two books which have proved very enduring — Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* and J. S. Mill's *Political Economy*. They are full of descriptions of existing conditions and of actual evils, but also full of direct advice and exhortation. You say that what is generally needed is to get people to think of realities. Is not the most effective mode of making people think to get them involved in controversy? It is a rare auditor that is not stimulated to attention by the purpose or hope of replying to your argument or advice. At this moment the best means of making American voters think about what American honor requires as to standing by our recent comrades in arms is to get them involved in hot discussion about the merits of President Wilson and of the various candidates for the presidency. After the armistice, millions of Americans gave up thinking about the War and its objects, and wanted to dismiss the subject. Through keen interest in political, industrial, and financial topics they are gradually coming back to the righteous ideals of the war with Germany in April 1917. None of us can see how long this process is going to last. I find

the slump in moral purpose and idealism very mortifying: but I have some hope that through political and industrial controversies we shall get back on to the plane of 1917....

Sept. 20, 1921

... With regard to human nature and the progress of the human race, I could wish that you could allow yourself full enjoyment now, and put into your future writings, all that is implied in the one clause "though the balance is clearly to the credit side of the account." Is not that belief just what we all need to keep our own spirits wholesome toward God and the universe which He directs?

Are you sure that the different nations of Europe are hating each other with virulence? Take France, for example, are the French people feeling hatred toward Germany? It seems to me that the French people are governed by fear or dread rather than by hatred. Is it not the same in Poland and in Greece? Both of those peoples seem to me to be in great fear of losing the new independence they have acquired through the action of the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles; and these fears seem inevitable so long as the United States hold aloof from the proceedings needed to restore stable government and peace in Europe....

CHAPTER XVII

1918-1926

Last years and letters — The Ninetieth Birthday Celebration — Mrs. Eliot's death — Dr. Walcott's account of a visit — The End

THE world, which turned from the war to take stock of its wounds and its hopes, found itself to be a new, although a weary world. The fact of departures, changes, differences was very palpable — especially so to the aged. We have all known people who, since 1914, have simply "given it up," and sought comfort in some private absorption. Others, still less fortunate, have found no consolation. Only the youthful of years and the unwearied of spirit accepted, without dismay, the confused but stinging challenge of the new era. If Eliot had folded his hands saying that his days of labor were ended, and that the new generations must move on without him, it would have seemed a natural thing for a man of eighty-five to do. To be sure, he resigned from almost every board and committee in which he had hitherto continued to serve, but he did that, not for the reason that his interest in their work was abating, but because he deemed it wise that younger men should be enlisted and because the physical fatigue of journeying to meetings was becoming considerable. We may hold it to have been the latest proof of the sanguine habit of his mind and the inexpugnable vitality of his impulse to be busy with the better-

ment of society that he kept on exerting, in behalf of "causes" as well as for individuals, the full measure of the physical strength that remained to him.

Had he, in doing so, shown himself wholly insensible to the doubts that others felt, it would perhaps have been a sign that he had lost the capacity to take in new impressions. Letters to Bryce toward the close of the last chapter indicate that such was not the case. During the ensuing years his papers and addresses were as full as ever of painstaking recapitulations of fact. Several times he expressed the hope that he might not "outlive his faith in democracy." It is surely significant, in this connection, that he should have admitted the thought of such a possibility. Perhaps the suggestion had come to him from what he had seen happen to Charles Francis Adams and Henry Adams, or from the despondency which he saw settling upon the mind of his friend and summer neighbor, James Ford Rhodes; perhaps it came from some other definite but unnamable source. But, he had always been intuitive about the currents of contemporary opinion; and although there were many outward signs that the East as well as the West was embracing democracy more resolutely than ever before, he could see counter-currents setting toward authoritarianism. He could not regard them as anything but sinister. If he felt uneasy sometimes, that merely showed that he was still impressionable. "Sam," he exclaimed one day to his son, "I don't seem to get interested in Heaven; I want to know what's to happen to the World Court." "What is there for you and me

to do" — he wrote to Moorfield Storey, who was likewise an indefatigable crusader and, therefore, despite sundry differences, a kindred spirit; — ... "What is there for you and me to do except fight near and tangible evils most of our time, and in the balance try to set forth the moral principles and motives on which alone human progress can be based? For myself I take the most satisfaction in fighting well-recognized evils, like the industrial war, alcoholism, militarism, venereal diseases, and racial discrimination." And again, this time apropos of Harding's election and America's abandonment of the League of Nations, "When a good cause has been defeated, the only question that its advocates need ask is when do we fight again."

He continued to write for the magazines and press and, with decreasing frequency, to speak in public. Mr. Howe's bibliography¹ lists eighty-three articles and addresses published during the years 1914 to 1923. Nor does it tell the entire story, for it omits many speeches of restricted interest, as well as some letters to the public press. Apart from the educational questions upon which he could usually pronounce an opinion without special preparation, and apart from several short memorials of men who had been his contemporaries or collaborators, the subjects of these discourses included questions related to the League of Nations, the Swiss System of Military Training, Capital and Labor, Zionism, Social Hygiene, Unity Among the Churches, Prohibition, the Presidential

¹ In *A Late Harvest*.

Election of 1920, Anglo-American Relations, Civil Service Reform, and America's Rôle in the Near East.

The fact was, in short, that in his relations to the public, Eliot had become an institution; and it is proverbial that institutions go on. The responses that floated back to him were like a chorus of bland adulation. The newspapers, whose editors are good judges of what interests the public, continued to give prominence to all that he had to say. Of course, his readers were not always persuaded to agree with him — and it seemed as if he did not always get to grips with practical aspects of the new issues in the masterful way that had formerly been his wont. But there was as much balance and ripeness of moral wisdom as ever in what he said. Those qualities, and courage, were the ones for which he was valued and honored.

Also, something venerable spoke in his words. He was referred to as the "last of the Puritans." The adjective "last" was significant, for it avowed a recognition of precious survival. However much he may have been a democrat, he was also, indubitably, an old-fashioned New England patrician. He had been a typical utilitarian; "a Benthamite man," somebody had called him. And now he had lived on into a day which had turned away from puritanism, and had withdrawn its faith from the rationalizing, self-denying creature whom the utilitarians postulated as the normal man. But the new generation, although it was taken up with fresh theories and new modes of thought, still recognized in Eliot and his principles something that would not brook dismissal. He seemed to

tower as steadfast as a noble monument on a retreating horizon.

This chapter will show that besides listening to him, the community continued to confer honors upon him.

The first of the letters of which this chapter, like the two which preceded it, will be largely made up, replied to one in which the President of the Carnegie Foundation had expressed his regrets over Eliot's withdrawal from the Foundation's Board of Trustees.

To Dr. Henry S. Pritchett

April 24, 1919

Your letter of April 21st gives me sincere satisfaction. I have been withdrawing lately from several Boards on which I have served; and they have all testified regret at my withdrawal, but chiefly apparently on the ground that I have contributed to the interest of their meetings by expressing opinions which were not the opinions of the Board. They seemed to think that they owed to me a certain enlivenment of their meetings. As to the Carnegie Peace Board, I know that I like to meet personally twice a year the majority of the members of the Board; and I am prepared to believe that they at least like to meet me. As to Mr. Root, I have felt a warm regard for him ever since he explained to me at a dinner of the New England Society of Brooklyn (where we both spoke — with some differences of opinion) that "the trouble with him was that

he was a partisan by nature and by practice in his profession."

I am not "feeling badly" physically, though I have some senile infirmities which restrict somewhat my usual activities; but I am constantly anxious about Mrs. Eliot, who has been an invalid for more than a year past, and has been obliged to give up her normal life, which was a very active and animated one till within two years. It is in the highest degree improbable that either of us will again visit the California coast; but we do hope to get again to Mount Desert, and to pass the coming summer there in something approaching our usual manner. Do let me know if you ever come to Boston. There are many things which I should like to talk with you about....

I heard a rumor the other day that you were putting the Carnegie Corporation into preventive medicine work. There is no better field for an endowment intended to promote the public welfare. Indeed, it seems to me that preventive medicine is going to be the best means of attacking, resisting, and suppressing the great evils which afflict civilized mankind; namely, epidemic diseases, premature death, alcohol, prostitution and its consequences, waste, and luxury. Successful resistance to and suppression of these evils will depend in the long run on the better education of all classes in the community; and in education it is the endowed institutions that have to do all the pioneering.

Affectionately yours,...

To Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler

April 26, 1919

I have just been reading with great satisfaction your address "Is America Worth Saving?" It is all sound and convincing. The only thing I do not like about it is its title. That suggests a doubt about the future of the American Republic. I believe that the right way for guides of American opinion is never to question or entertain a doubt about the future of the United States. In the body of your address I think there is only one sentence which suggests any such doubt; that is the sentence on the seventh page near the foot which begins "democracy has begun to decay when it becomes, etc.," and that might just as well have stated that "democracy would have begun to decay if it became, etc."

On October 5, 1919, Eliot went to Washington to participate in the Industrial Conference that had been called by President Wilson. There was probably nothing that interested him so much at that time as industrial relations. But the Conference proved to be "the most mortifying performance by Americans that [he] ever took part in — mortifying because of lack of knowledge, intelligence, and public spirit." The Labor group, which had brought in too contentious a program, abandoned the Conference on October 23, leaving the so-called Employers' and Public groups, of the latter of which Eliot was a member, to go on as they would. On the 24th, Eliot found himself the only member of his group voting

to honor Secretary Lane's request to remain in session. But "by the time the two-hour debate was over, I was completely satisfied that the Group, as constituted, could render no further service, seven members had left Washington the day before, seven others gave notice at the meeting that they were going home and walked out of the room, and ten of the remaining eleven seemed to be in a state of extreme fatigue, nervous tension, or homesickness." The eleventh was, apparently, Eliot himself. On getting home he wrote to Dr. Dunham that he had lost three pounds and a half during the month and that Mrs. Eliot, who had remained in Cambridge most of the time, had lost two and three-quarters. "We missed each other very much at meals and all other times, because we had never been so long separated since we were married."

When, in 1920, a Roman Catholic was elected to the Harvard Corporation, a good many people shook their heads and said that such a choice could not have been made if Eliot had still been President of Harvard. This supposition, it will be seen, was unfair.

To Jerome D. Greene

April 5, 1920

...The appointment of James Byrne seems to me a decidedly interesting experiment. He is one of the most devoted Harvard men that I know, and has been ever since he was an undergraduate of the College. The advent of a rational Catholic to the Corporation may have various

good consequences. It thoroughly illustrates the genuine liberality of the characteristic Harvard spirit. You will find it interesting to watch in coming years for the effects of the election on the Catholic laity of this country. There are, of course, two serious objections to the appointment. The first is his age. He is too old for beginning service on the Corporation; and secondly I fear that he is no longer a strong man, competent to undertake at all seasons the necessary journeys from New York to Boston. It is a good point in his favor that he thoroughly understands the prepondering value of the professional departments of the University, already numerous, and likely to be more numerous still in the future. The President and Fellows are much more enlightened on this subject than the Corporation of 1869 was; but still I am inclined to think that Byrne can be of use to them on just that matter....

The reader has seen that Roosevelt's ways often excited antagonism in Eliot; but his virtues were also appreciated, as the next letter shows. If the dinner at the White House to which it refers left a strong impression upon Eliot, it was also an occasion when his impressive presence was felt by others. One of the guests has told me how the party adjourned from the dinner table to a room which President Roosevelt then used as a study. When Roosevelt and Eliot had seated themselves, the whole company, including its vivacious host, formed a circle about the older man as naturally as iron-filings group themselves about the pole of a magnet.

To Dr. Christian F. Reisner

Jan. 25, 1921

DEAR DR. REISNER, —... During his [Roosevelt's] first term of office he gave a dinner for me at the White House which left a strong impression on my mind. It was a dinner for men only. I sat at the President's right, with Mr. Justice Holmes on his left. All the other places at the table, ten or a dozen in number, were filled, as the President explained to me, with what he called "his young men." No member of his Cabinet was present; and these young men were heads or high officials in various Bureaus within the Departments, all of them having highly responsible work....

You ask me for my estimate of the effect of Theodore Roosevelt's life on the nation. It seems to me that the effect of his life is going to be in the main wholesome, invigorating, and uplifting, although qualified by two serious defects, his love of risky adventure, which often carried him and his companions quite beyond the limits prescribed by good sense or good judgment, and his lawlessness when existing law stood in the way of his accomplishing objects which seemed to him, not only righteous, but indispensable to the progress of his country or of civilization. Posterity may wonder at the extraordinary variety, volume, and impulsiveness of his writings and speeches, at his enjoyment of dramatic effects, and his hasty judgments of men; but all the same he will remain for generations a popular hero and an exemplar for aspiring youth....

It must have become apparent to the reader that Eliot's religion was more a matter of disposition and attitude than of elaborately reasoned doctrine. That was, indeed, what he believed religion ought to be. His own statements are accordingly to be taken as expressions of his feeling, not as clues to a rationalized philosophical superstructure. Now that he had reached an age when it was to be supposed that the hereafter must seem imminent to him, people sometimes tried to sound his beliefs, and a few brought him confessions of their own difficulties. To one of these was addressed what comes next.

To Rev. —

March 7, 1921

... I never heard before such a candid statement of a complete change of mind in a minister about the relations of God to man as you made to me on Saturday last. At first I thought you must be exaggerating the depth and breadth of the change of mind; but as you gave me the details of your experiences ... and told me how you had become a humanitarian instead of a minister, and further that you could no longer conduct public prayer, I perceived that your description of your present state of mind was as accurate as it was candid.

I am a Unitarian by birthright and environment, and have never accepted any of the common creeds, dogmas, and catechisms, or believed in the God they described; but life would look intolerable to me if I lost faith in the God that Jesus describes in the first three Gospels, or in the

Creator of a boundless universe of order and beauty. You seem to have found an adequate foundation for a useful and happy life in Jesus's command to love the neighbor, and in the Parable of the Good Samaritan.... I notice in a good many young men that their religion seems to consist chiefly in a burning desire to be of service to those they love and to their own community; but I cannot help thinking that "to walk humbly with thy God" is a very important part of religion....

In order to relate the foregoing with what may best be placed beside it, a slight interval between dates may be ignored. In 1923, Mrs. Charles Sumner Bird asked Eliot to write a prayer that might be used by the Committee on International Relations of the Federation of Women's Clubs. He replied:

July 19, 1923

DEAR MRS. BIRD, — I have reflected on the proposal contained in your note dated July 10th; but am clear that I cannot meet your wishes. I have no personal experience of prayer, except of the nursery prayers which for centuries have been taught to Anglo-American children in this country, and of the kind of prayer which Jesus expected his disciples to offer when he told them to enter into their closets and pray to their Father in secret. Public prayer, oral or manuscript, is not possible for me.

I have had, however, many minister friends who had no difficulty in using printed prayers or public oral prayer

on the spur of the moment, and have enjoyed listening to them. Phillips Brooks was one of these friends....

Mrs. Bird wrote again to say that what was wanted was a prayer that could not be connected with any particular church or religious organization, and asked him to reconsider. Eliot then sent her what follows. (The project for which this prayer was wanted was never carried into execution.)

Prayer

Almighty Father, it is Thou who deliverest from evil the frail children of earth. We thank Thee with all our hearts for present deliverance from many scourges that have long afflicted Thy creatures, and from the dread of them. Make us strong and eager to fight the evils and wrongs not yet overcome. Help us to resist selfishness, greed, and evil passions in ourselves and in others. Help us to seek peace and pursue it, peace among nations and in communities and families, and to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee. Teach us to see the infinite beauty and abounding love in the world, and to look up with adoration and answering love to Thy Perfect Love and Goodness. Amen.

To Mrs. —

May 26, 1924

It does not seem to me that we *know* anything about immortality. Nevertheless I feel free to *believe* that man

has a soul as well as a body, and that the death of the body does not involve necessarily the destruction or ceasing of the soul. Indeed, almost everybody thinks that in the make-up of a fine personality the soul tells more than the body. Personally I have never been able to see that any of the Heavens or Paradises described in sacred or profane literature would be even tolerable for a person who had had fairly happy experience of earthly life. The idea of an eternity of rest is positively repulsive to any man or woman, primitive, barbarous, or civilized, who has had joy in work.

Forty years ago I found myself sitting at a club dinner next Dr. James Freeman Clarke, who had been for many years an eminent Unitarian minister in Boston, Professor of Natural Religion and Christian Doctrine for four years in the Harvard Divinity School, and a member for more than twenty years of the second Governing Board of Harvard University. Dr. Clarke had just got about again after a serious attack of pneumonia from which he almost died. I asked him how it seemed to be looking at imminent death. His answer was, "I felt no fear or any anxiety about my future. God has been very good to me in this world, and I just trust Him about another life." I advise you to trust the loving God about your mother's future and your own.

I imagine that there is some public or university library in —— from which you could obtain the Life and Work of Louis Pasteur by his son-in-law. Pasteur was the most successful practitioner of the modern scientific method of

advancing human knowledge that the world has ever seen; but he was also a devout Catholic. Find the place in that book where he is described as sitting by his dying child holding her hand, and declaring that he *believed* that he should meet her again in another world. Pasteur made the right distinction between knowing and believing. He was sure that he *knew* nothing about immortality, but he was also sure that he was free to *believe* about it whatever was necessary to his happiness. Modern Science has no conflict with belief in another world and in the reunion there of friends lost for a time. It, however, resists authoritative imposition of opinion or practices by either Church or State.

I think, also, that you might get some comfort from reading the last two pages of "Charles Eliot, Landscape Architect," my oldest son who died young, an irreparable loss to his profession, the community, and his kindred, and especially to his father who had come to depend very much on his sympathy and advice.

If you say — "the state of mind of people to whom their 'God' has been 'good' gives me no consolation or hope — No God has been or is good to me — I am beside myself at the death of my mother, and want to *know* that she lives on and that I shall rejoin her" — I can only suggest, first, that God has been good to you in giving you such a mother, secondly, that your mother trusted in God, and thirdly, that you yourself may have many years in which to apply Edward Everett Hale's advice — "Look up and not down; look forward and not backward; *look out and not*

in; and lend a hand." If you say — "there is no God" — I can only ask how a speck of a mortal, living for a moment on an atom of an earth in plain sight of an infinite Universe full of beauty, wonder and design, can confidently hold so improbable a view. Sincerely yours,...

"To my thinking" — said Eliot in another letter — "no one needs to find God; because in Him we live and move and have our being, literally, completely, and now."

The chronological sequence may now be resumed.

To Jerome D. Greene

July 19, 1922

...I have just read your letter of 17 July about my providing some biographical background of my writings. At first blush, I see no way of writing any autobiographical paper, sketch, or memorandum. I have never kept a diary or journal, or written anything which could serve the object you have in view. To do any such work would be really repulsive to me. Several times of late — by of late I mean since my powers of resistance have diminished — I have written some accounts of my boyhood and youth, and of some personal incidents during the earlier years of my Presidency of Harvard; but I rather wish that I had never written them. I do not believe that I could under any circumstances produce such destructive autobiographies as Charles Francis Adams and Henry Adams wrote, or even a book so full of mistakes as George F. Hoar wrote. My fundamental idea is probably that my biographer can

find in my letters and reports as much evidence about my disposition and personality as readers of my *Life and Letters* will need or be good for. The kind of biography that I should prefer is a record drawn from my reports and other official documents of the number and quality of the bricks that I built into the walls of Harvard University. Serviceable institutions last; as to persons, "Time like an ever rolling stream, Bears *all* its sons away." Moreover, I share James Bryce's opinions about the impropriety of revealing confidences between two persons just because one of them has died. Once a confidence, always a confidence, unless indeed one has no belief whatever in immortality....

On another occasion he remarked — "As to being read a hundred years hence, I haven't the smallest expectation or desire of any such waste of time on the part of future generations. I am entirely content with an ephemeral influence, added to the contribution of some bricks laid in the walls of a durable institution."

To Lady Bryce

Feb. 24, 1923

...I find [the volume of Bryce's "Memories of Travel"] delightful reading matter, very instructive, and very charming. Take, for instance, the chapter on "Impressions of Palestine, 1914." It has given me a better picture of the Holy Land than I have ever obtained before, either from reading or conversation. Within a month I have had

long talks with two highly educated American Jews, one a Zionist and the other an anti-Zionist, both men having visited Palestine since the British occupation for the purpose of estimating the present needs of Palestine as a Jewish Colony. Their descriptions of what they saw were infinitely inferior to Bryce's. Then how many pages there are in this book which have great beauty and charm of style! Take, for instance, the page from the bottom of 170 to near the bottom of 171: "The hills are flat-topped ridges" . . . through "and green boughs wave in the wind." That is very charming writing, highly rhythmic, and decorated with well-chosen words, mostly monosyllabic. How sure his ear was in the selection of words! For instance, he said, "mountains" instead of "hills" in the phrase "to which mountains are dear, because rills make music." Take, again, the last two pages of "Impressions of Iceland, 1872." Those two pages reveal the accurate, balancing, just spirit in which he was to travel all the rest of his life. The last two sentences in that chapter are perfect as regards both matter and style.¹

As I can read for pleasure only about an hour a day in all, "Memories of Travel" will last me a week yet. . . .

On May 7, 1923, the New York Civic Forum awarded its Medal of Honor for Distinguished Public Service to Eliot. He did not feel able to travel to New York to at-

¹ "Iceland had a glorious dawn, and has lain in twilight ever since; it is hardly possible that she should again be called on to play a part in European history. But the brightness of that dawn can never fade entirely from her hills, or cease to ennoble the humble lives of her people."

tend the ceremonies in person, but he sent a brief message which his grandson, Charles W. Eliot, 2nd, read in his behalf after speeches had been made by Mr. Elihu Root, Rev. Henry van Dyke, Mr. James Byrne, Dr. John Finley, and Mr. Robert E. Ely; and Mr. J. D. Greene accepted the medal for him. To this occasion, and to Mr. Greene's statement that the medal would be "cherished" by President Eliot and his descendants, the next letter refers. The "gold medal," which is also mentioned, and which had been awarded to him in 1915, was the first medal presented as a recognition of special distinction by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In the following year, 1924, he received the Roosevelt Medal for Distinguished Service.

To Jerome D. Greene

May 11, 1923

Your remarks in accepting that medal on my behalf were very much to the point, and were neither too long nor too short. Will you kindly tell me how your very last remark can possibly be made true? How in the world can I or my descendants cherish this gold medal? The previous large gold medal which I received could not possibly be kept on show in my house, and so has been deposited in the vaults of the Cambridge Trust Company for some years. Tired of this mode of cherishing it, I gave it to the Museum of Fine Arts; but I observe that the Museum merely keeps it in a safe. A bronze medal can be "cherished" by the recipient and possibly by his descendants;

but a gold medal cannot be.... I did not listen in Cambridge to the evening's proceedings, having declined Ely's offer to put a radio set into my study. As you say, I should have found it "pretty trying," although an enthusiastic Harvard man who lives in Cambridge, and used a radio set, assured me that he heard every word clearly. What a formidable invention "broadcasting" is! A means of spreading much ill-considered talk all over the country. Is it going to be like the omnipresent noise which automobiles have introduced into both city and country life, or like the distracting roar of aeroplanes overhead?

Affectionately yours,...

To Lady Bryce

March 19, 1924

... A Committee of Harvard graduates has got up a formidable celebration of my ninetieth birthday which occurs tomorrow. Thousands of people are going to take part in it representing an extraordinary variety of opinion, occupation, and religious and political connection. For a month past telegrams and letters of a laudatory and congratulatory character have been pouring into this house at an overwhelming rate. Many of them are from strangers who allege that they received lasting benefit from something they heard me say or from something I have printed. It is a consequence of the fact that most of my service has been educational or has been related in some way to the general public welfare. Bryce ought to have lived for such a commemoration of his ninetieth birthday; but he does not need it; for he is going to live in the


memories of the friends he made all over the world, and in his writings, which have a remarkable durability....

The celebration of his ninetieth birthday, which occurred the following day, has been commemorated in a volume which contains a complete record of the proceedings.¹ The ceremony was arranged by the Harvard Alumni Association and the Associated Harvard Clubs with the coöperation of an honorary committee of citizens formed under the patronage of the President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Governor of Massachusetts, and the Premier of Canada. An academic procession formed in Memorial Hall and then moved into Sanders Theater where the exercises began at half-past three. The Boston Symphony Orchestra and the Harvard Glee Club provided music and, after an invocation by Dr. Francis G. Peabody and an address of welcome by the president of the Alumni Association, Mr. Justice E. T. Sanford of the Supreme Court, brief speeches of salutation were made by President Lowell, Mr. George Wigglesworth, President of the Board of Overseers, Dean Briggs of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Charlton MacVeagh of the Senior Class, and C. T. Greve of the Associated Harvard Clubs. President Angell of Yale spoke for other

¹ *The Ninetieth Birthday of Charles William Eliot, Proceedings in Sanders Theatre and the Yard, March 20, 1924.* (Harvard University Press, 1925, 8vo, pages 260.) This volume contains, in addition to the program and verbatim reports of the proceedings, the messages that were delivered unread from ninety-nine Harvard Clubs in different parts of the world, 148 colleges and universities, fourteen Learned Societies, and resolutions of the Massachusetts Senate and House of Representatives.

colleges, universities, and learned societies; Governor Cox for the Commonwealth; Chief Justice Taft on behalf of the American public. Bishop Lawrence announced the presentation of a million and a quarter of gifts to the University in honor of the occasion. President Eliot, who had not previously been informed just what would take place, then rose and made the short speech of acknowledgment which follows:

“DEAR FRIENDS: The affectionate note of these tributes goes straight to my heart. It fills me with wonder; but it touches me deeply. This day is going to be one of the happiest and most delightful of my memories. I have received the encomiums of the speakers with a certain sense that I have not been fully understood. One of them said that I had an unusual amount of courage. That has never entered my mind. I confess to recognizing another quality to which President Lowell referred — a readiness for combat. I look back upon my life as a boy, sometimes engaged in the rough-and-tumble fights which we boys used to have on Boston Common, and I recognize that at a tender age I did display considerable enjoyment of fighting. But when it comes to maturer life, I find that the source of this quality described as courage is simply this — that I never stopped in any attempts of mine because I encountered opposition. I was just regardless of risks and opposition. I was eager to do something in the future. It was that part of my nature which enabled me to look forward and not back, to look out and not in.



THE PRESIDENT EMERITUS ACKNOWLEDGES A COLLEGE CHEER
ON HIS NINETIETH BIRTHDAY

“Now at the close of my life, or near the close, I do not know any better advice to give to the graduates of Harvard College, or to the undergraduates, than that contained in those two phrases of Edward Everett Hale’s: ‘Look forward and not backward — Look out and not in.’

“I confess I received with great delight what the President of the University said about the spreading influence of Harvard in the present day; but we of the household do not say much about that.

“I recognize that I have been unusually strong and have had unusually good health, and that a great deal of the influence I have exerted — what has been described as my personality — is derived from those two facts, strength and health; and with those two advantages went a great joy in work, — just in work. I do not stop to consider why I had joy in work. I never looked in enough to think of that. But joy in work has been the source of a large part of the satisfactions of my life. Now, that is just a gift of nature — from grandparents as well as from parents. Those inheritances determined my life in many respects. They determined my natural disposition towards work, towards research, towards persistent inquiry. This liking for research was developed in me in Harvard College through the personal kindness of my teacher in chemistry, Professor Josiah P. Cooke, who took me into his private laboratory. He gave me (from 1850 to 1853) the opportunity to learn what the process of scientific experimentation and search for truth was. My friends, I was the only under-

graduate between 1849 and 1853 who had any such blessing. It was a sense of this privilege that first enlisted me, when I became a teacher of Harvard College, in the advocacy of choice among studies; it first induced me to call for volunteers from my class in prescribed mathematics to do a hard piece of surveying work — the first call for extra work in the field that was ever made on a College class.

“To go back to the description given by another of the speakers of my conduct as President, I may say that I recognized the accuracy of his description, particularly when he said that in listening to debates in the Faculty and in inviting my opponents to speak, I was probably pursuing with a good deal of perspicacity a study of those men — that I was making up my mind whether these zealous opponents were of the right stuff to be made professors in Harvard University. That is just what I was doing.

“Consider now the sources of my career as a teacher. Those sources were in the times, in that wonderful period of human history, in which my whole educational career lay. Think of it! When I was coming on as a teacher in Harvard, the great prophets and exponents of experimental science in Europe and America were taking possession of that great field. Think how the philosophers of the world were preaching attention to the individual and proclaiming the immense variety of human nature. Think how James Russell Lowell told us in 1886 that democracy must not only raise the average mass, but must give a free field to all the finest qualities of human nature;

for that is the only salvation for democracy. Think how Emerson came into power in the days of my youth. Think how Oliver Wendell Holmes, as a teacher of anatomy, physiology, and the carrying of contagion, enlarged the conception of human sagacity, penetration, and discrimination, and combined with that instruction great power of expression in both prose and poetry. Think how Asa Gray, Joseph Henry, Jeffries Wyman, Benjamin Peirce, and Louis Agassiz were the leaders in American science and in methods of teaching science. All that came out of the times when I was a young teacher in Harvard; out of that extraordinary period have come the ideals and the lessons which I have followed all through my active career. Then, as the years went by and the period of combat and persistent effort against opposition passed, and the new structure of Harvard University began to take effect, think how the Divisions and the Faculties gave me the opportunity to see where modern education was going, and where it ought to go. Now and then I could help their labors, especially in the Medical Faculty; but it was the strength of the Harvard Faculties themselves which filled me with strength and what is called leadership. I gave expression and opportunity to their hopes, aspirations, and devotions; and great was the privilege of so doing. You must therefore attribute the successes which I have been privileged to win to the very fortunate circumstances of my life, to the leadership of the extraordinary philosophers and scientists of my time.

“And now I want to say a word to the graduates of

Harvard here assembled. I cannot find better words than those I used in my inaugural address in October, 1869. They apply to-day.

“‘There have been doubts, in times yet recent, whether culture were not selfish; whether men of refined tastes and manners could really love Liberty, and be ready to endure hardness for her sake....In yonder old playground, fit spot whereon to commemorate the manliness which there was nurtured, shall soon rise a noble monument which for generations will give convincing answer to such shallow doubts; for over its gates will be written: “In memory of the sons of Harvard who died for their country.” The future of the University will not be unworthy of its past.’

“How the young Harvard men have demonstrated in the World War that that last line is true. — ‘The future of the University will not be unworthy of its past.’ But let me, finally, emphasize the duty of Harvard men, of all educated men, to serve their country in peace as well as in war. I call upon the younger Harvard graduates, and by and by I shall call on the undergraduates, to serve their country with devotion and at sacrifice in peace as well as in war.”

At five o'clock the meeting adjourned. Eliot and other dignitaries then proceeded to the Yard where a large gathering of students was waiting. A low platform had been erected in front of University Hall. When Eliot had mounted this platform, the Chief Marshal of the Senior

Class presented short addresses for the students of several departments, and he spoke to the students. He advised them to serve their country in peace as well as war, to commit to memory Pasteur's definition of democracy as "that form of Government which leaves every citizen free to do his best for the public welfare"; to try to find out, while they were in college, what work they could find joy in all their lives; to avoid introspection; not to put off marriage too long; and not to stick in a profession if they found they had chosen it wrongly. The celebration ended with cheers and the singing of "Fair Harvard."

Mr. J. D. Greene, who had been largely responsible for the arrangements, and Eliot's family, who had no part in them, were no little anxious lest the excitement and exertions of such a day should have an unfortunate effect; but Eliot enjoyed the whole occasion and bore its fatigues easily. That evening, over a game of dominoes with Mrs. Eliot, he looked up and said complacently, "I could hear everything that was said to-day except Frank Peabody's prayer." — "And that," replied Mrs. Eliot, "was not addressed to you, my dear." He was hugely delighted, and repeated her retort as if he reckoned it to have been the climax of the happy day.

The next letter looks back to the struggles of the early seventies over the reform of the Medical School. It was addressed to the son of Eliot's former doughty opponent, Dr. Henry J. Bigelow.

To Dr. William Sturgis Bigelow

March 28, 1924

That box of orchids which you sent me on my birthday was really superb. It gave both Mrs. Eliot and me great pleasure and remains a precious memory.

The relations between your father and you always interested me very much, especially at the time when you thought that you wanted to have some more knowledge of natural history before you entered upon the practice of medicine. And your father's relations with me I also find the subject for pleasant reminiscence.

He did his best to defeat my plans for the reconstruction of the medical faculty and the medical school; and I did my best to bring to naught his efforts in that direction. But all along he manifested a decided liking for me personally, which doubtless began as far back as 1851-1852.

About that time he wanted to try an experiment on the nævus on my face, having read of successful operations by a Viennese surgeon on similar blotches. I was glad to have the experiment tried, but was much surprised to discover that your father did not know how to make the powerful freezing mixture which was required. He did not know the difference between chloride of lime and calcium chloride. The experiment failed, though pushed to a point beyond which your father said he did not dare to go.

At that time I think your father made a diagnosis of my disposition and general quality, which he did not forget when in later years we came in decided collision....

There is another incident in your life and mine which I like to recall and I hope you do also, — namely, your appointment as lecturer on the Buddhist doctrine in 1908–09. Is that doctrine helpful to you now, as you lie waiting for the end of earthly life? The teachings of Jesus Christ help me very much as I too wait for the leap in the dark. Sincerely yours....

In 1918 Mrs. Eliot had begun to experience symptoms of arterial and cardiac distress. Her freedom of movement was impaired and, after a year or two, it became greatly restricted. Later still she was confined to her room and her easy-chair most of the time. Occasionally her condition improved for a while. Each autumn she made the journey from Northeast Harbor to Cambridge successfully, and at the beginning of each succeeding summer again, she was well enough to move to the house on the Maine Coast. But after arriving there in 1924 her strength began to fail, and in August it became evident that the end was near.

Although Eliot trusted devoutly that the personalities and loves of this world are somehow taken care of hereafter, his imagination pictured no particular heavenly order upon the anticipation of which his spirit could repose a simple trust. In the splendors of this physical world and the beauty of unselfish, eager living, the divine always seemed immanent to him. From the sense of life and youth he had drawn strength as did Antæus of old from the touch of his mother Earth — from life, for which

his zest had been unquenchable; from youth, ever beautiful and ever renewing its promise and always about him. As his vigil beside his dying wife seemed to be drawing to its end, he turned to them for support. On the fifteenth, he called at Francis G. Peabody's house, and, after answering inquiries, requested that an infant grandson of Mr. Peabody's might be brought down to the sitting-room. The mother brought the baby to him and he took it and held it for a while. When he got up to leave, Mr. Peabody walked out of the door with him and there, after a moment's silence, Eliot said, simply, "I wanted to hold in my arms a life that was just beginning."

The next day, Mrs. Eliot died.

Eliot sought relief from the sense of loneliness that overwhelmed him, as he had in every other time of trial, by forcing himself to meet the demands of the moment and by turning to work. At the funeral service, which was held at the house, he stood up and sang all five verses of "Lord of All Being Throned Afar" so strongly that only those who could watch his face would have suspected his emotion. Then he immersed himself, as he had for days before Mrs. Eliot's death, in long hours of correspondence. Mrs. Charles Eliot moved into the house, and thereafter she or her daughter Grace dined with him and read to him every evening and breakfasted with him every morning.

The next letter, which was dictated ten days after the funeral, replied to the question "how so thoroughgoing a

believer in personal liberty" could approve the Volstead Act.

To Dr. Henry S. Pritchett

Aug. 29, 1924

... Now for Prohibition and the Volstead Act. You are quite right in thinking that I have always been and still am a thorough-going believer in personal liberty for men, women, and children. I have opposed all the recent proposals for giving the Government of the United States supervision and control of education and other matters which have heretofore been left to the States and municipalities. Thus, I opposed from the beginning and am still opposing the proposition that a substantial control of education by the United States should be placed in the hands of a Cabinet officer at Washington with a numerous staff and a huge appropriation at his disposition. Why then do I support the Prohibition Amendment and the Volstead Act?

I think the fundamental reason is that I have been perceiving for many years, since first New England rum and then whiskey became very cheap, that the use of alcohol as a beverage threatens seriously the existence of the white race. I have known intimately the process of destroying family life and of breeding sickly or deformed children, several cases having occurred in my own family on both the paternal and maternal sides among the five generations with which I have been acquainted. I have also been acquainted with many cases of the same sort

among the college or university families I have known at Harvard. In both these directions I have seen the evils produced by alcohol alone, and also by the use of alcohol combined with prostitution, a combination which is so common, resulting from the brothel or from the newer method of telephone assignation. Through both observation and reading I have become convinced that cheap alcohol threatens the existence of the white race; but until Prohibition took on the nation-wide form I was unable to see how this evil could be resisted. Through forty years' observation of Prohibition in Maine I became satisfied that State Prohibition was impracticable; and by many years' experience of local option in Massachusetts I saw that easy access to intoxicating drinks could not be prevented in that way. On the other hand, the remarkable success of the action of the National Government against drink and prostitution in the neighborhood of the camps in which millions of young men were being prepared for service in France led me to believe that nation-wide Prohibition would probably succeed.

In my childhood and youth when there was no public water supply in either Boston or Cambridge there was good reason for using drinks which were made by boiling the water which was their necessary base, like beer, tea, and coffee; but now that reason has no longer any force.

Having thus come to see that a grave evil threatens the American Commonwealth, my instinct is to fight that evil by every promising means, although the means at hand may involve some temporary modifications of polit-

ical or social theories which I have long held. I enclose two leaflets on this subject which explain pretty well my reasons for favoring some abridgment of personal individual liberty in order to attain a great collective good. I hope they will explain to you my willingness to continue to restrict personal liberty to the extent of prescribing by law what individuals may drink in their own houses. That liberty does not seem to me to be very important, and I do not expect the laws which interfere with that particular liberty to be followed by laws interfering with any other personal liberty. I should be satisfied, however, with an agreement on the part of Congress and the Administration that the Volstead Act first should be fairly enforced, and secondly should have a trial for a specified period like five or seven years....

"I myself," said Eliot in another letter, "used beer and wine when in company, but with no ardor, and neither ever produced any perceptible effect on me." Being a man of strong head and restrained appetites, he probably never had experienced the sensation of even mild alcoholic intoxication. Several reasonably authentic stories have it that he could consume, without betraying its influence at all, an amount of champagne that sufficed to exhilarate others, and that in company he sometimes did. In fact he seems to have been more sensitive to caffeine than to alcohol. He talked against coffee and tea more than against alcohol and used to like to startle people by such a remark as "I made a bad speech last night.

I was garrulous and diffuse. In fact I was intoxicated — I had taken a cup of coffee.” It appears that as long ago as 1870 his brother-in-law, Francis G. Peabody, had unwittingly made a deep impression by saying to him, while Eliot was calling on him one night after a dinner, “Charles, what have you been doing? I’ve never known you to be so voluble. Have you been drinking?” He had drunk nothing but a cup of coffee; and from that day he never used coffee or tea except on rare occasions, nor did he forget the incident. Guests who stayed in the house at Northeast Harbor used to be met at the breakfast table with the following, uttered in Eliot’s impressive way: “We can give you coffee. We also have Postum Cereal. It is excellent. Will you have Postum Cereal?” And most guests meekly accepted Postum Cereal.

In April, 1925, after giving a talk at a celebration at the Boston Latin School, he had what he called a slight shock of paralysis. It caused him pains in his legs and arms, but the effects vanished by June 1st, and, by the middle of that month, he journeyed, not uncomfortably, to Northeast Harbor for the summer. For a while, everything went well. Although muscularly he was very feeble, he could drive in a comfortable motor car and get out on the water.¹ The boat was always handled by others now,

¹ The motor car had been presented to him by Mr. Charles R. Crane, and had replaced a less comfortable one. Gifts generally excited in Eliot some anxiety about the sanity of the giver. When “Crane’s car” as he called it, arrived he inquired whether Mr. Crane was beginning to lose his mind. — When Mr. F. W. Allen, of the banking house of Lee, Higginson & Co., was reorganizing the affairs of the Collier Publishing Company and informed Eliot that a royalty beyond the fee originally agreed upon would

and Eliot, when aboard, refrained from comment or advice as a supercargo should. Mr. Charles Hopkinson describes an excursion when he was skipper and the others in the boat were Judge Franklin G. Fessenden (an old gentleman who knew nothing about sailing), Mrs. Charles Eliot, a twelve-year-old granddaughter of Eliot's, and Eliot who, having been helped to a seat on a bench in the cockpit, remained there motionless. The thirty-foot sloop ran into a breeze which freshened until the lee rail went under. Eliot was sitting on the lee side. Hopkinson, feeling responsible for the boat and its helpless company, watched the whitecaps increasing and the deck going lower and lower, and Eliot sitting unmoved. Finally he could bear it no longer and made the grandchild hold the tiller while he got the mainsail down, brought the boat before the wind, and ran her into calmer waters and home to the landing. After Eliot had been helped ashore, he turned and made his first and only comment. "I think, Charles, that I should have dropped the peak."

In August he was prostrated by an attack of shingles that lasted more than three months. Never in his life had he had an illness that remotely approached this in degree and duration of suffering. The pains, which felt as if they began in his left eyeball and traveled thence all over his body, were almost unbearable, and when his doctor admitted to him that the medical profession knew little that could be done for shingles, Eliot told him, indig-
thenceforth be paid him on sales of the Five-Foot Book-Shelf, Eliot's first response was a letter to one of Mr. Allen's partners asking, in effect, whether there was anything the matter with Mr. Allen.

nantly, that that was a "disgrace to the profession." At the end of three months the pain suddenly ceased, but it left a disability in his right hand, which thereafter prevented him from using it to write. Letters were put aside during this illness and his correspondence was hardly resumed, by dictation, until after Christmas. Then, he announced himself as quite sure "that I am gaining in general strength so that I live in hope that my present disabilities will soon cease." Rheumatic pains invaded his disabled hand, however. One day, Theodore Lyman, Jr., the son of Eliot's old friend, asked him whether his sleep was not disturbed by these rheumatic aches. Said he, "No; when I get into bed I take pains to put this hand in the most comfortable possible position; and then I make haste to go to sleep." To such a remarkable degree could he still control his bodily processes.

Dr. Henry P. Walcott has given an account of his last visit to Northeast Harbor — in 1925. It was taken down stenographically and runs as follows:

"I did not expect to see him during the summer (of 1925), but I got a note from him in which he was pleasantly insistent that I should go down, and I went down — went over from Dark Harbor, where I had been staying. He said in his note: 'You will not find it easy — I don't think it is a good thing for you to go over to Rockland and spend the night on that boat. You had better make Dr. Shattuck bring you over in a boat or else take the morning boat to Blue Hill, and I will send Martin over for you with the automobile.'

"Well, it was a pleasant trip that way, so I went to Blue Hill. There was Martin with the automobile and he said:

"Mr. Eliot thought it would be a good thing for Joanna' — that was one of the trusted servants — 'to have an excursion, so he told me to bring her over.' And then he said, 'You started at six o'clock in the morning from Dark Harbor; he thought you probably would be hungry, so he had a luncheon put up for you' — which I did not expect and did not want. We got over to Mount Desert and after luncheon he said:

"Let us go out and have a trip on the water; I have not been out yet. I have had a rough roadway made down to the water's edge so that we have not got to climb over the hill.' We went down and got into the motor boat and went around the harbor and had everything as pleasant as could be, as usual. He had the same interest in everything, was asking Orrin about what these people were doing and what those people were doing. We got back to the house and I thought that was the end of the day. But not at all. It was a very delightful summer's day; he said: 'We will go over to Hadlock.'

"So he had out his automobile and we went over to Hadlock Pond, which was one of his favorite views, with Brown Mountain in front of it — which I hope they will name Mount Eliot. He had the automobile driven down to the water's edge and then we came back.

"There was every day some pleasant excursion or other. Then the last Sunday I was there I went to church

with him in deference to his going, which I did not generally do. In the afternoon he said:

“‘It is a very pleasant afternoon and we will go over to the western edge of the Island on Somes Sound.’

“‘So we went over there. Then he said:

“‘We have got time enough; I will show you something new.’

“‘So we went up to the mainland, on the Ellsworth Road, then turned down on what is called the Old Ellsworth Road to a point skirting the water which is nearly opposite the western hills, where there is a wonderful view of the western hills.

“‘I said, ‘You have never shown me this before.’ He said, ‘No, I never saw it myself until three weeks ago’ — showing his continued interest.

“‘Then the last day was one of those wretched Mount Desert days when the thermometer never got anywhere near 60, and there was a heavy fog and it was cold, and sitting in front of his wood fire was the pleasantest thing to do. But I was going up by the boat to Rockland. When the time came I got ready and I noticed he was putting on his coat. I said: ‘What under heavens are you doing?’

“‘He said, ‘I am going down to the steamboat wharf.’

“‘I said, ‘I don’t want you to do it; if you go down with me it will be the first uncomfortable drive we ever had together.’

“‘‘Oh,’ he said, ‘I am going.’

“‘So he got in and, as I said, it was uncomfortable, because it was a cold, disagreeable day. We got down to

this dismal shed and were standing there. He looked about, I noticed; there was nobody else there. I heard the whistle of the steamer not very far off. Then he turned around suddenly — somebody had come into the shed and he took him by the arm, brought him up to me and said:

“‘Now, So-and-So, my friend Dr. Walcott is going up on this boat as you are, and I want you to keep your eye on him, because I don’t think as he does that men of our age are safe to be traveling around alone.’

“Well, of course, that was his whole object in going down, — the possibility of finding somebody that he could turn me over to. It was so thoroughly characteristic. Most men in a similar situation would have entrusted me to the hired man. He would have done it for anybody if he thought they needed it.”

Eliot showed less inclination to ponder upon the past than do most old men; perhaps because he had maintained a firmer hold on the present and kept up a lively interest in the doings of others and a genuine enjoyment of all forms of activity and relaxation that were still possible for him. But, more especially after Mrs. Eliot’s death, members of the family who were near him perceived that his thoughts were reverting frequently to the people and the scenes he had loved. He spoke of Ellen Peabody Eliot more often than ever before. He found comfort in reminders of affection he had awakened, in little evidences that his influence had been helpful, and in little testimonials of respect

for his fairness, wisdom, public spirit.¹ Words that testified to these things were sweeter to him than the medals and diplomas that he did not know what to do with, for he could treasure them in his thought. Sometimes he brought them out in conversation as simply as an athlete might have placed a well-earned silver trophy on the dining-room sideboard. He relished the little rewards now that he could no longer feel the fountain of his own energy overflowing from its abundance. They assured him that he had been right; from outside him and roundabout him they corroborated his faith that what is best is to serve one's fellow men, and confirmed his belief in the potency of the individual, in sincerity, and labor, and patience. They showed him the influence of his long effort enduring in others, and so promised him a dim but yet real immortality in this realm of earthly being. Signs of these broodings occasionally slipped into the rapidly dwindling stream of his correspondence. The last sheaves of it make upon one who has read it all an impression that matters of the hour, concerning which he did still question and reply, were beginning to import less to him than the tender reachings of his memory. And so, with a few notes that

¹ Mr. Rollo W. Brown speaks of a caller who told Eliot how much, as an undergraduate, he had enjoyed watching him going about his work in the College, and had wished to express his admiration, but had never done so. Eliot beamed with pleasure and said, "Do you know, *that* is the great joy of living to be an old man. Not a few Harvard men have said much the same thing to me within the past few years. If I had died at seventy or eighty, I should have missed all that." (Rollo Walter Brown, *Lonely Americans*, 43-44.) Mr. Brown's essay contains several interesting anecdotes or reminiscences, but its emphasis on Eliot's "loneliness" seems to the present writer to be inappropriate.

breathe the old man's serenity and deep loyalty to his loves, these quotations from his letters must draw gently to their close.

To Mrs. Arthur Lyman

Oct. 4, 1924

DEAR SUSIE, — I want to thank you heartily for the beautiful dish of grapes which reached me here the day after I got home from Mount Desert. They reminded me, as always, of the gifts Aunt Nancy used to send often to my mother when I was a boy in 31 Beacon Street; and they recall the warm affection and regard which you have shown these many years for my dear wife and for me. May you never know the void in which I am now living.

Affectionately yours,...

Oct. 21, 1924

In the last note I wrote to you I expressed a hope that you might never feel the void I have lately been suffering. I should not have used the word "void," because so many children and grandchildren are trying hard to fill that void with their own loving service and their fresh and forward-looking interests.

I thank you for the fragrant and delicious gifts you left at my door last Saturday.... Affectionately yours,...

Feb. 10, 1925

What a long memory you have! These camellias which I have just examined look just like the camellias her

brother George Lyman used to send to my mother from Waltham at this time of year. I find myself getting more and more reminiscent as my actual working power and memory for recent things diminish; and there are no sweeter reminiscences for me today than those connected with Waltham through my mother, Aunt Nancy, Cousin Arthur T., and you and Arthur.

Affectionately yours,...

To Jerome D. Greene

March 20, 1925

DEAR JEROME, — Professor Grandgent and Mr. Seymour have just brought me the handsome volume which contains the proceedings at my ninetieth birthday — a book which got through the Harvard University Press yesterday. It gives me my first impression of the variety and number of the messages which were sent to me on that occasion. I of course took in the addresses which were made to me in Sanders Theatre; but I looked at very few of the messages that came by letter and telegram — not more than ten or twelve. I think they were all acknowledged by Miss McConnell and Ruth Pierce; but it was a formal acknowledgment on a letter sheet, and I never saw them. I really never studied those four handsome volumes of the messages which you made up and are now in Widener Hall. So you see I am sure to find much pleasant reading in the volume....

*To Lady Bryce**Jan. 14, 1926*

...I hope very much that you have in your own mind a vivid picture of Bryce's behavior on the last day of that visit you two made us at Mount Desert when he told me that during his many summers at Mount Desert nobody had ever taken him to the Outer Duck, which he had always wanted to visit, and asked me to take him there that day. We went with only Orrin Donnell as an aid. We landed with difficulty on a rocky point on the northerly side of the island, and climbed up to some rocks which afforded tolerably comfortable seats. After our luncheon, Bryce announced that he proposed to walk the whole length of the island and look over the lighthouse and fog horn apparatus at the southwesterly end. In an hour and a half he was back again full of admiration of the wind-swept trees scattered about the island and of the lighthouse and fog horn equipment.

It was then time to start for home. It was quite a struggle for the skilful Orrin to get us all safely on board. The wind was still favorable, and the air clear and full of sun. The whole range of hills was visible to the naked eye, and the sun being well in the west, the westerly slopes of the range were in bright light and the easterly in shadow. Parts of the range rose abruptly from the water. Bryce declared it was the most fascinating and lovely view he had ever seen, and gave his reasons for finding it so. The wind continued to be light but favorable; and for an hour Bryce continued to state that the view before him was the

most perfect one he had ever seen. This was the man who undoubtedly had seen more of the grand and splendid scenery of the world than any person then living. He had stood on the summit of Mount Ararat all alone when the native guides he had enlisted to take him to the top stopped a long way from the summit and declined to go further on the ground that the top was inhabited by imps and malignant spirits who would kill them all if they went further. He was familiar with all the grandest scenery in Switzerland, South America, and with the Rockies and the Sierras in North America.

When at last the party got back to the house in the late afternoon, I noticed that you and Bryce spent much of the remainder of the afternoon and the evening in your chamber; and I have hoped ever since that he or you then wrote out an account of the day's experience we had together. And I never saw Bryce again....

Eliot's ardent wish, throughout the spring months of 1926, was that he might be strong enough to reach the coast of Maine again. Happily, this wish did not have to be disappointed. But his energy, already greatly reduced, continued to ebb. During the first part of the summer, he constantly hoped to gather strength enough to go out in *The Hearty*. "A few days more and we will take a short cruise." Meanwhile he sat by his window and watched the grandchildren or Orrin Donnell, the boatman, sail the boat out of the little bay or bring her home to the mooring. But he could not even be moved down to the



THE SUNSHINE AT ANCHOR

wharf in a wheel-chair, and by August, he no longer spoke of going on the water. His hours were spent in his own house, and on its veranda. Sweet summer airs blew through the open windows and doors and brought him the odors of the fir trees and of the beaches at low tide. If a day was foggy, a log fire burned on the hearth. Mrs. Charles Eliot was living in the house. His son Samuel, and his granddaughters or several of their number were constantly near by, and one of them at least was beside him whenever he wanted company. But his mind, though clear, was no longer active. Then came days when he was content to keep his bed.

On the 15th or 16th of August, he suddenly and quite simply informed his son, Samuel, that he was going to die on the following Saturday. He had expressed his wishes about a simple ceremony in the Union Church at Northeast Harbor, a funeral service at the College Chapel in Cambridge, and burial at Mount Auburn. He now explained further that it would be best for him to die on Saturday because the family, and others who might have to go to Cambridge, would find the Sunday train more comfortable than a week-day train. During Thursday and Friday he was unconscious most of the time. Saturday dawned and passed without change. Sunday morning, August 22, he recognized members of the family and spoke to them lucidly, then sank again into a doze. After lunch, a nurse being alone with him at the moment, and he being propped up with pillows in bed, he exclaimed, "I see Father!" The nurse, astonished, stepped to his side

and asked whether he wanted anything. A shadow passed over his face as he made an effort of attention and murmured, "No, nothing." Then, after a pause, "I see Mother." A moment later, his head sank upon his breast ——

The inevitable end had been painless, and he had died where he wanted to be. "What beautiful things we leave behind!" he had once exclaimed as he sailed away — For other hearts now, and other eyes and later days.

Cambridge is a deserted town at the end of August, but people returned from near and far to be present in Appleton Chapel; not to mourn, but to share the deep emotion of gratitude and love that presided over a memorable service. The quiet departure of the hero of half a century of public-spirited endeavor set people to pondering; and that afternoon old Harvard students who were scattered across the continent, teachers innumerable, and faithful readers of Eliot's words said to themselves: "He once wrought upon the very structure of our characters. He opened paths for our children's feet to follow. Something of him will be a part of us forever."

THE END

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

CURRICULUM IN HARVARD COLLEGE IN THE AUTUMN TERM OF 1868-69

Reprinted verbatim from the College Catalogue for that year (pages 28 to 35)

COURSE OF INSTRUCTION

FRESHMAN CLASS

FIRST TERM

1. *Greek.* Xenophon's Memorabilia. — Homer's Odyssey. — Goodwin's Greek Moods and Tenses. — Exercises in writing Greek.
2. *Latin.* Livy (Lincoln's Selections). — Cicero's Epistles. — Ramsay's Elementary Manual of Roman Antiquities. — Zumpt's Grammar. — Exercises in writing Latin.
3. *Mathematics.* Peirce's Geometry. — Peirce's Algebra, begun.
4. *French.* Otto's Grammar. — Modern French Theatre. — Classic French Theatre. — Exercises.
5. *Elocution.*
6. *Ethics.* Champlin's First Principles of Ethics. — Bulfinch's Evidences of Christianity.
7. *Integral Education.* Lectures.

SECOND TERM

1. *Greek.* Lysias. — Homer's Odyssey. — Felton's Greek Historians. — Greek Antiquities. — Goodwin's Greek Moods and Tenses. — Exercises in writing Greek.
2. *Latin.* Horace, Odes and Epodes. — Cicero's Tusculan Disputations. — Zumpt's Grammar. — Ramsay's Elementary Manual of Roman Antiquities. — Exercises in writing Latin.
3. *Mathematics.* Peirce's Algebra, finished (including Logarithms). — Peirce's Plane Trigonometry.
4. *History, in French.* Histoire Grecque par Duruy.
5. *Elocution.*

APPENDIX A

SOPHOMORE CLASS

FIRST TERM

1. *Rhetoric*. Themes.
2. *History*. Student's Gibbon.
3. *Chemistry*. Cooke's Chemical Physics.
4. *Elocution*.
5. *German*. Weisse's German Grammar. — Exercises. — Rölker's German Reader.

ELECTIVE STUDIES

1. *Mathematics, Ordinary Course*. Goodwin's Elementary Statics. — Puckle's Conic Sections.
2. *Applied Mathematics*. Kerr's Elements of Rational Mechanics.
3. *Pure Mathematics*. Puckle's Conic Sections.
4. *Advanced Mathematics*. Introduction to the General Theory of Functions.
5. *Greek*. The Prometheus of Aeschylus. — The Alcestis of Euripides. — Plato's Apology and Crito. — Exercises in writing Greek.
6. *Latin*. Cicero de Officiis. — Quintilian. — Zumpt's Grammar. — Exercises in writing Latin.
7. *Italian*. Cuore's Grammar. — La Fiera. — La Rosa dell' Alpi.
8. *English*. Vernon's Anglo-Saxon Guide. — Morris's Specimens of Early English. — Chaucer.

SECOND TERM

1. *Rhetoric*. Themes.
2. *Philosophy*. Stewart's Philosophy of the Mind. — Reid's Essays.
3. *Chemistry*. Cooke's First Principles of Chemical Philosophy. — Lectures.
4. *German*. Grammar and Exercises. — Rölker's German Reader.
5. *Elocution*.

ELECTIVE STUDIES

1. *Mathematics, Ordinary Course*. Puckle's Conic Sections. — Goodwin's Elementary Dynamics. — Lectures on the Law of Gravitation.

2. *Applied Mathematics*. Kerr's Elements of Rational Mechanics.
3. *Pure Mathematics*. Spherical Trigonometry. — Puckle's Conic Sections.
4. *Advanced Mathematics*. Introduction to the General Theory of Functions. — Analytic Geometry of Three Dimensions.
5. *Greek*. Demosthenes. — Grote's History of Greece, Vol. XI. (Chapters 86–90.) — The Birds of Aristophanes. — Greek Composition.
6. *Latin*. Terence. — Cicero. — Horace. — Exercises in writing Latin.
7. *Italian*. Cuore's Grammar. — Francesca da Rimini. — Tasso's Gerusalemme.
8. *English*. Studies of the First Term continued.

JUNIOR CLASS

FIRST TERM

1. *Physics*. Herschel's Outlines of Astronomy, last edition.
2. *Philosophy*. Bowen's Logic.
3. *Rhetoric*. Themes.
4. *Chemistry*. Lectures.

ELECTIVE STUDIES

1. *Mathematics*. Peirce's Algebra, Chapter VIII. — Peirce's Curves and Functions, Vols. I and II.
2. *Applied Mathematics*. Kerr's Elements of Rational Mechanics. — Elements of the Differential and Integral Calculus.
3. *Ancient History*. Polybius. — Greek Composition.
4. *Greek*. Aeschines and Demosthenes on the Crown. — Greek Composition.
5. *Latin*. Pliny's Letters. — Martial. — Latin Exercises and Extemporalia.
6. *Chemistry*. Galloway's Qualitative Analysis, with instruction in the Laboratory.
7. *Natural History*.
8. *English*. Vernon's Anglo-Saxon Guide. — Morris's Specimens of Early English.

9. *German*. Weisse's German Grammar. — Exercises. — Schiller's Tragedies.
10. *Spanish*. Gil Blas. — Josse's Grammar and Exercises (Sales's ed.)
11. *Italian*. Cuore's Grammar and Exercises. — La Fiera. — Dall'Ongaro's La Rosa dell' Alpi.

SECOND TERM

1. *Philosophy*. Hamilton's Metaphysics. — Forensics.
2. *Physics*. Lardner's Course of Natural Philosophy (Optics). — Lectures on Hydrostatics, Pneumatics, etc.

ELECTIVE STUDIES

1. *Mathematics*. Peirce's Curves and Functions, Vols. I and II.
 2. *Applied Mathematics*. Kerr's Elements of Rational Mechanics. — Elements of the Differential and Integral Calculus.
 3. *Ancient History*. Polybius. — Greek Composition.
 4. *Greek*. The Electra of Sophocles — Plato. — Greek Composition.
 5. *Latin*. Plautus. — Latin Exercises and Extemporalia.
 6. *Chemistry*. Galloway's Qualitative Analysis, with instruction in the Laboratory.
 7. *Natural History*.
 8. *English*. Studies of the First Term continued.
 9. *German*. Grammar. — Exercises. — Goethe's Tragedies. — Heine.
 10. *Spanish*. Josse's Grammar (Sales's edition). — Gil Blas.
 11. *Italian*. Cuore's Grammar. — Francesca da Rimini. — Tasso's Gerusalemme.
-

SENIOR CLASS

FIRST TERM

1. *Logic and Philosophy*. Bowen's Ethics and Metaphysics. — Bowen's Political Economy. — Forensics.
2. *Physics*. Lectures on Optics and Acoustics.
3. *History*. Modern History.

ELECTIVE AND EXTRA STUDIES

1. *Philosophy*. Mill's Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy.
2. *Mathematics*. Peirce's Curves and Functions.
3. *History*. Constitutional History of England.
4. *Chemistry*. Crystallography and Physics of Crystals.
5. *Greek*. Thucydides. — Greek Composition.
6. *Latin*. Quintilian. — Cicero against Verres. — Latin Exercises and Extemporalia.
7. *German*. Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. — Goethe's Faust. — Lectures on German Grammar. — Themes.
8. *French*. Lectures on French Grammar. — La Fontaine's Fables. — Bossuet.
9. *Spanish*. Josse's Grammar (Sales's edition.). — El sí de las niñas.
10. *Italian*. Cuore's Grammar and Exercises. — Tasso's Gerusalemme. — Dante.
11. *English*. Thorpe's Analecta Anglo-Saxonica. — Mätzner's Altenglische Sprachproben.
12. *Modern Literature*. Lectures.
13. *Patristic and Modern Greek*.
14. *Geology*. Lectures.
15. *Anatomy*. Lectures.

SECOND TERM

1. *History*. Modern History.
2. *Religious Instruction*.
3. *Rhetoric*. Themes.

ELECTIVE AND EXTRA STUDIES

1. *Philosophy*. The History of Philosophy.
2. *Mathematics*. Peirce's Analytic Mechanics.
3. *Greek*. Thucydides. — Greek Composition.
4. *Latin*. Lucretius. — Latin Exercises and Extemporalia.
5. *History*. Constitutional History of the United States.
6. *Chemistry*. Mineralogy and Determination of Minerals.
7. *German*. Nibelungen Lied. — Lectures on German Literature.
8. *French*. Demogeot's Histoire de la Littérature Française. — Molière.

9. *Spanish*. Don Quijote. — Calderon.
10. *Italian*. Dante.
11. *English*. Studies of the First Term continued.
12. *Zöology*. Lectures.
13. *Modern Literature*. Lectures.
14. *Patristic and Modern Greek*.

The Hebrew Language is taught to those who desire to learn it.

EXERCISES IN COMPOSITION AND ELOCUTION

THE Sophomore and Freshman Classes have each an exercise in Elocution once a week.

The Junior Class has an exercise in Themes once in three weeks, and the Sophomore Class once in five weeks.

The Senior Class has four exercises in Forensics in the First Term, and four in Themes in the Second Term; and the Junior Class has four exercises in Forensics in the Second Term.

Each Class writes Greek and Latin Exercises.

ELECTIVE AND EXTRA STUDIES

I. ALL the studies of the Freshman Class are *required*.

II. The *required* studies of the Sophomore Class are Chemistry and German (each two hours a week through the year), and History and Philosophy (each two hours a week one Term). The *elective* studies are Greek, Latin, Pure Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, English, and Italian. Each Sophomore must elect in such a way as to occupy *eight* hours a week with his elective studies. See the Tabular View.

III. The *required* studies of the Junior Class are Philosophy (two hours a week), and Physics (three hours a week). The *elective* studies are Greek, Latin, Ancient History (in Greek text-books); Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, Chemistry, Natural History; the English Language, and German. Of these elective studies each Junior may choose *three* or *two* (at his pleasure), and receive marks for the same. In each elective department there will be three exercises a week. Spanish and Italian may be taken as extra studies (without marks), with two exercises a week in each, and are *required* of those who propose to elect these languages in the Senior year.

IV. The *required* studies of the Senior Class are History, Philosophy and Ethics (*together* five hours a week). The *elective* studies are Greek, Latin, Mathematics, Physics, Chemical Physics, History, Philosophy, and Modern Languages (French, German, Italian, and Spanish). In each elective department there will be three exercises a week. Each Senior may choose *three* or *two* electives (at his pleasure), and receive marks for the same. Special students for honors may be permitted to devote the whole nine hours to *two* elective departments, under such restrictions as may be prescribed. Marks will be allowed in Modern Languages in the Senior year to *advanced students* only.

Special honors will be assigned at graduation (in the diploma or in some other appropriate manner) for distinction in the elective departments.

Themes, Forensics, Declamations, and attendance at Lectures, are also required.

EXAMINATIONS

EACH Class is examined annually, in writing, in the several studies of the year, before committees appointed for that purpose by the Overseers; and the results of these examinations have an important bearing on the rank of the Student, and, in some cases, on his continuance in College.

MUSIC

INSTRUCTION in Music is given to those Undergraduates who desire it, and are sufficiently acquainted with the Rudiments.

The instruction includes practice in Vocal Music, and lessons in Thorough-Bass and Counterpoint.

Tabular View of the Exercises during the First Term of 1868-69.

Italics indicate Elective or Extra Studies.

Class	8—9.	9—10.	10—11.	11—12.	12—1.	4—5.	5-6.
MOND. Fr. Sop. Jun. Sen.	I. French. II. Greek. III. <i>Gr. IV. Latin.</i> I. Philos. III. Physics Philosophy.	I. French. IV. <i>Gr. III. Gr. IV. Latin.</i> II. Philos. <i>Spanish. Latin. Span. Ital.</i>	Themes. I. <i>Math. 2. German.</i>	I. II. Ethics. <i>Ad M. 1. E. 1. II. C. 1. E. 2. I. 2. M. Math. 1. Germ.</i>	III. IV. Ethics. <i>A. P. Math. 2. Eng. 2. II. A. P. Math. 1. I. 2. Eng. Chemical Physics.</i>	I. Greek. 3. French. I. <i>Latin. II. Greek. I. Physics. 2. French.</i>	III. Greek. III. <i>Lat. IV. Greek. II. Phys. III. Physics. Greek. I. French.</i>
TUESD. Fr. Sop. Jun. Sen.	I. Math. II. Latin. I. <i>Math. IV. Chem. 2. Germ. 1. Nat. Hist. I. Philos. I. History.</i>	III. Math. IV. <i>Lat. 2. Math. II. Chem. 1. Nat. Hist. 3. Germ. III. Philosophy.</i>	<i>Pure Mathem. 2. German. 1. History.</i>	I. II. Greek. 2. French. <i>(Roman Hist.) E (2. H.) (R H)</i>	III. IV. Greek. 3. French. <i>Chemistry* Anatomy.</i>	I. Latin. II. Math. I. <i>Chemist. II. Eloc. I. Lat. Anc. History. II. History.</i>	III. Latin. IV. Math. I. <i>Fr. II. Chem. IV. El. 2. Latin. I. Philos. III. Hist.</i>
WEDN. Fr. Sop. Jun. Sen.	I. Math. II. Greek. I. <i>Greek. II. Latin. I. Philos. III. Physics I. History. Philos.</i>	III. Math. IV. <i>Gr. II. Greek. IV. Lat. II. Philos. Spanish. Latin. Span. Ital.</i>	<i>Greek. 1. Math. 1. History.</i>	I. II. Ethics. <i>A. M. 1. E. 1. II. C. 1. E. 2. I. 2. M. Math. (2. Hist.)</i>	III. IV. Ethics. <i>A. P. Math. 2. Eng. 2. II. A. Math. 1. I. 2. Engl. Chemical Physics.</i>	I. Greek. II. Math. I. <i>Latin. II. Greek. I. Physics. II. History.</i>	III. Greek. IV. Math. III. <i>Latin. IV. Greek. II. Phys. III. Philos. III. History.</i>
THUR. Fr. Sop. Jun. Sen.	I. French. II. Latin. I. <i>Hist. IV. Chem. 1. Germ. 2. Nat. Hist. Philosophy.</i>	2. French. IV. <i>Lat. II. Chem. III. Hist. 1. Nat. Hist. 3. Germ. Latin. Span. Ital.</i>	2. <i>German. 2. German.</i>	I. III. M. IV. <i>E. A. Gr. 1. A. Lat. (Roman Hist.) E. 1. G. (R. H.)</i>	II. IV. Math. I. <i>Eloc. 2. Advanced Latin. Chemistry* Anatomy.</i>	I. Latin. 3. French. I. <i>Chem. II. Hist. I. Lat. Anc. History. 2. French.</i>	III. Latin IV. <i>Hist. 2. Latin. Greek. I. French.</i>
FRID. Fr. Sop. Jun. Sen.	I. Math. II. Greek. I. <i>Mathematics. III. Physics. 1. Germ. II. Philosophy.</i>	III. Math. IV. <i>Gr. 2. Mathematics. 3. German. III. Philosophy.</i>	III. <i>Elocution. Pure Mathem. Gr. 2. M. 2. G. I. Hist. 2. Germ.</i>	II. <i>Elocution. A. Gr. 1. A. Lat. N. E. 1. G. (2. H.)</i>	Lecture. <i>Advanced Latin. Eng. A. P. Math. 1. Math. Chemical Physics.</i>	I. Greek. II. Latin. I. <i>Eloc. II. History. I. Phys. Anc. History. I. Philos. 2. French.</i>	III. Greek. IV. <i>Latin. 1. Fr. II. El. IV. Hist. II. Physics. Greek. 1. French.</i>
SATUR. Fr. Sop. Jun. Sen.	I. Latin. II. Math. I. <i>Hist. 2. French. 1. Latin. 2. Nat. Hist. II. Philosophy †</i>	III. <i>Lat. IV. Math. III. Hist. 3. Fr. 1. Nat. Hist. 2. Lat. I. Philosophy ‡</i>	<i>Geology.*</i>	SENIORS.— <i>Modern Literature.* Monday, Geology.* Wednesday, at 3 o'clock. JUNIORS.—Elocution. Monday and Wednesday, at 3 o'clock. SOPHOMORES.—Advanced French, Monday and Thursday, at 3 o'clock. FRESHMEN.—Advanced French, Monday and Thursday, at 3 o'clock.</i>			

* Lecture.

† In two divisions.

NOTE.—From the beginning of the First Term till the Thanksgiving recess, Morning Prayers will begin at a quarter before seven o'clock, and the hour of dinner will be one o'clock. After the Thanksgiving recess, Morning Prayers will begin at a quarter before eight o'clock, all the Morning Exercises will be held one hour later than the time indicated in the Table, and the hour of dinner will be two o'clock.

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF EIGHT COLLEGES (1868 TO 1870)

Note: The following table is made up from the catalogues of the colleges named. The catalogues are not altogether comparable with each other and the figures cannot be collated with complete confidence; but the margin of doubt is not large. The college president is always reckoned as a teacher. How much or little any particular person taught cannot be determined. Persons whom the catalogues list as "lecturers" are not counted. Generally speaking, instruction by lecture had not yet been organized.

	Teaching staff of academic or Arts Department (College)	Electives	University enrollment	
<i>Harvard</i> 1868-69	27	More or less freedom in the last 3 years. Discussed in the text.	Academic (college) Resident grads. Lawrence Sci. Sch. Other profess. schools	529 5 75 441 1050
<i>Yale</i> 1869-70	18	Two-out-of-three choice between calculus, Greek and Latin during $\frac{2}{3}$ of Junior year. German could be substituted for astronomy or Latin during $\frac{1}{3}$ of Senior year.	Academic Sheffield and Professional Schools }	518 218 736
<i>Columbia</i> 1869-70	14	None.	Academic School of Mines Law and Med. Schs.	129 79 568 776
<i>Princeton</i> 1869-70	17	Announced that a few hours of electives would be offered to Juniors and Seniors the next year.	Academic	280
<i>U. of P.</i> 1869-70	16	Limited and small range of choice in last 2 years.	Academic Sci. Course, } Med. and Law } about about	124 525 649
<i>Williams</i> 1869-70	11	None.	Academic	159
<i>Amherst</i> 1869-70	16	Practically none.	Academic	255
<i>Dartmouth</i> 1869-70	13	Practically none.	Academic Medical Sci. and Agricul. Depts. }	261 109 370

Of the 130 teachers counted in the foregoing table, 127 are assignable to different subjects according to their titles. Sixty-three and a half fall to Greek, Latin, Mathematics and Astronomy, "moral philosophy"; thirty and a half of these to Greek and Latin.

In the Harvard College Faculty of 1868-69 there were eleven full professors (the president and all appointees holding lower rank, omitted). Of these the sciences might claim two; modern languages and literatures, other than English, one.

APPENDIX C

GRADUATE SCHOOLS OF HARVARD AND JOHNS HOPKINS

TABLE I

THE following is the first part of a table which shows where Professor Cattell's thousand leading men of science had obtained their Bachelor's degrees and where they had pursued graduate studies. Although it would be a mistake to attach great weight to such statistical indications, the figures are interesting, particularly those in the second and third columns. The column headed "Graduate Study" credits to the institutions named only those who did graduate work without receiving a doctorate from the institution. Professor Cattell says that the thousand men under consideration in this table "pursued their graduate studies on the average from fifteen to twenty years ago,"¹ that is, between 1886 and 1890.

University	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Study	Ph.D.	Grand Total
Harvard.....	106	74	57	237
Johns Hopkins...	27	42	102	171
Yale.....	52	13	28	93
Columbia.....	28	12	38	78
Cornell.....	31	17	26	74
Michigan.....	35	8	10	53

(Institutions for which the grand total falls below 50, omitted.)

The number of the thousand men of science who had done graduate study in European universities appears to have been large; e.g., Berlin, 117; Leipsic, 84; Göttingen, 69; Heidelberg, 56.

¹ Cattell, "Statistical Study of American Men of Science"; *Science*, N.S. (1906), xxiv, 740.

TABLE I

ANNUAL ENROLMENT AND DEGREES AWARDED ¹

Year	Enrolment in Harv. Grad. Dept. (to 1890) and Grad. School (after 1890)		Enrolment of Graduates (including Fellows) at Johns Hopkins	Doctorates Awarded at Harvard	Doctorates Awarded at Johns Hopkins
	Total Resi- dent	Total Regis- tered			
1876-77.....	42	61	54	4	..
1877-78.....	38	67	58	7	4
1878-79.....	31	50	63	3	6
1879-80.....	38	52	79	5	5
1880-81.....	30	43	102	3	9
1881-82.....	37	50	99	1	9
1882-83.....	36	56	125	5	6
1883-84.....	46	80	159	6	15
1884-85.....	53	72	174	4	13
1885-86.....	50	71	184	6	17
1886-87.....	64	78	228	2	20
1887-88.....	84	97	220	7	27
1888-89.....	89	99	202	6	20
1889-90.....	96	111	209	8	33
1890-91.....	117	132	233	8	28
1891-92.....	187	200	298	6	37
1892-93.....	200	216	297	13	28
1893-94.....	248	259	261	18	34
1894-95.....	255	272	284	18	47
1895-96.....	280	299	253	18	36
1896-97.....	290	306	210	26	42
1897-98.....	278	293	215	26	36
1898-99.....	321	336	210	24	42
1899-00.....	326	341	185	36	35
1900-01.....	339	353	168	29	30
1901-02.....	304	315	172	31	17
1902-03.....	310	325	187	29	27
1903-04.....	412	427	202	47	35
1904-05.....	378	395	195	39	31
1905-06.....	393	409	162	46	32
1906-07.....	386	407	158	34	35
1907-08.....	406	424	171	43	28
1908-09.....	413	429	187	38	27

¹ The Harvard enrolment figures are taken from tables in the *Annual Reports* for 1886-87, p. 82; 1892-93, p. 110; 1908-09, p. 126. The record of doctorates awarded at Harvard by the Graduate Department and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences are made up from statements appended regularly to the *Annual Reports*. The Johns Hopkins figures are taken from the Johns Hopkins Catalogue for 1909-10.

APPENDIX D

TABULAR COMPARISONS OF GROWTH

THE growth of Harvard during President Eliot's administration is so frequently referred to — in this book and in other books and articles about him — that definite figures should be available. A few are here assembled.

Table I is taken, with grateful acknowledgments, from S. E. Morison's *Development of Harvard University*: Introduction, xc. Table III is taken from the same work (see page lxxxix). Three parts of Table II, and the graphic curve which follows them, are based upon figures compiled for an unpublished report to the Harvard Overseers by a "Special Committee to consider the Limitation of Numbers," in 1925-26. These figures give some idea of the relation between Harvard's experience and that of other institutions. In examining them the reader should bear certain facts in mind. *First*, during the first two decades Harvard was alone in providing a free choice among a large variety of subjects while at the same time insisting upon a high standard of admission. (The inference from the figures in table II, B would be that most people either (1) still preferred to send their sons to the old-fashioned colleges, or (2) were unable to prepare them to meet the Harvard entrance requirements.) *Second*, during the whole period of forty years it was ordinarily more difficult to gain admission to any department of Harvard University than to enter similar departments elsewhere. (This might have been expected to encourage a relatively greater resort to other institutions.) Bearing the foregoing points in mind, the figures and curves suggest the reflection that during President Eliot's administration the Harvard governing boards kept just about as far ahead of the academic procession as they could without causing student enrolment to lag behind a normal rate of increase.

TABLE I

NUMBERS OF OFFICERS AND STUDENTS, 1868-1909 ¹

	1868-69	1878-79	1888-89	1898-99	1908-09
Teachers of professorial grade	45	70	90	134	194
Other teachers and research fellows	14	65	108	277	416
Other officers	5	28	47	55	96
Undergraduates: Harvard College	529	834	1180	1851	2238
Scientific School	41	17	35	415	39
Students in other departments	480	475	684	1646	1605

TABLE II

(A) POPULATION NORTHEASTERN STATES (NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY)

Year	Population	Per cent increase between dates
1870	8,776,779	0
1880	10,224,516	16.5
1890	12,143,531	18.8
1900	14,744,580	21.4
1910	18,203,462	23.4

(B) REGISTRATION — TOTAL OF ALL DEPARTMENTS

Numbers				Per cent Increase Between Dates		
Year	Harvard	Yale	Columbia	Harvard	Yale	Columbia
1870	1,316	755	776			
1880	1,365	1,307	1,532	3.7	37.3	97.4
1890	2,271	1,645	1,671	66.4	58.6	9.1
1900	4,288	2,542	3,176	88.8	54.5	90.0
1910	4,123	3,282	5,117	-3.8	29.1	61.1

¹ Not including the Governing Boards or the students in Summer Schools.

TABLE II — *continued*

Numbers				Per cent Increase Between Dates		
Year	Princeton	Brown	Amherst	Princeton	Brown	Amherst
1870	364	220	261			
1880	488	247	339	34.0	12.3	29.9
1890	850	352	352	74.2	42.5	3.8
1900	1,277	1,026	400	50.2	191.5	13.6
1910	1,450	935	502	13.5	-8.9	25.5

Numbers				Per cent Increase Between Dates		
Year	Dartmouth	Williams	Bowdoin	Dartmouth	Williams	Bowdoin
1870	436	141	121			
1880	429	227	157	-1.6	61.0	29.7
1890	462	311	185	7.7	37.0	17.8
1900	741	375	252	60.4	20.6	36.2
1910	1,229	543	338	65.8	44.8	34.1


Numbers				Per cent Increase Between Dates		
Year	Tufts	Cornell	Total	Tufts	Cornell	Total
1870	74	609	5,073			
1880	84	399	6,304	13.5	-34.5	24.3
1890	145	1,390	9,634	72.6	292.3	52.8
1900	802	2,521	17,400	453.1	81.4	80.6
1910	1,142	4,412	23,073	42.4	75.0	32.6

(C) FRESHMAN CLASS — HARVARD COLLEGE

Total Registration			Number from Northeastern States		
Year	Number	Per cent Increase Between Dates	Year	Number	Per cent Increase Between Dates
1870.....	189		1870.....	159	
1880.....	243	28.6	1880.....	191	20.1
1890.....	366	50.6	1890.....	301	57.6
1900.....	537	46.7	1900.....	421	36.5
1910.....	671	24.9	1910.....	538	27.8

TABLE II — *continued*

(D) POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES. (EXCLUSIVE OF OUTLYING POSSESSIONS) COMPARED WITH ENROLLMENT (BOTH MEN AND WOMEN) IN UNIVERSITIES, COLLEGES, AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS. REGISTRATION OF HARVARD FRESHMAN CLASS GIVEN IN HUNDREDS.



(Logarithmic scale gives just comparison of the rates of change)

APPENDIX D

TABLE III

SUMMARY FINANCIAL STATEMENT, HARVARD UNIVERSITY (1869-1909)

Year ended August 31, 1869

Endowment	\$2,387,232.77		
Income from		Expenditures:	
Investments	200,499.72	Salaries	\$122,597.49
Tuition	67,051.13	Awards to students	12,694.22
Term-bills	78,928.74	Annuities	10,390.78
Miscellaneous	1,163.78	Miscellaneous	124,722.12
Gifts current use	529.19		

Year ended July 31, 1889

Endowment	\$6,761,943.23		
Income from		Expenditures:	
Investments	713,883.05	Salaries	430,773.57
Tuition	350,139.46	Awards to students	73,656.27
Term-bills	91,090.78	Annuities	11,053.44
Miscellaneous	22,403.91	Miscellaneous	433,572.92
Gifts current use	124,226.75		

Year ended July 31, 1909

Endowment	\$22,716,759.24		
Income from		Expenditures:	
Investments	966,113.55	Salaries	944,649.02
Tuition	650,729.84	Awards to students	137,902.68
Term-bills	160,687.94	Annuities	34,185.12
Miscellaneous	75,524.90	Miscellaneous	1,562,199.19
Gifts current use	282,290.44		

APPENDIX E

CERTAIN INSCRIPTIONS COMPOSED BY ELIOT

CONCERNING the inscriptions on the two next pages Eliot made this minute: "The following inscriptions were prepared for the Water-Gate at the World's Fair, Chicago, in 1893, by request of Director Burnham. The shapes and sizes of the several tablets, and therefore the approximate number of letters which could be used on each, had been already determined. My plan was to commemorate on the side toward the lake the explorers and pioneers in the literal sense, and on the side toward the Court of Honor the pioneers of civil and religious liberty. The inscription beginning 'To the bold men,' on the side toward the lake, prepared the way for Lowell's splendid verse on the other side, 'But bolder they, etc.' That verse, the two Bible texts, Lowell's lines on the left lower panel toward the Court of Honor, and Lincoln's sentence on the right lower panel I selected; the rest I wrote."

INSCRIPTIONS ON THE WATER-GATE AT THE WORLD'S FAIR, CHICAGO.
TOWARD THE LAKE.

A FEW
DARED TOILED
AND SUFFERED
MYRIADS ENJOY
THE FRUITS.

TO THE BOLD MEN
THEIR NAMES REMEMBERED OR FORGOTTEN
WHO FIRST EXPLORED THROUGH PERILS MANIFOLD
THE SHORES LAKES RIVERS MOUNTAINS VALLEYS AND PLAINS
OF THIS NEW WORLD.

OF MANY RACES
TONGUES CREEDS
AND AIMS
BUT ALL HEROES
OF DISCOVERY.

THE WILDERNESS AND THE SOLITARY PLACE SHALL BE GLAD FOR THEM.

TO THE
BRAVE SETTLERS
WHO LEVELED
FORESTS
CLEARED FIELDS
MADE PATHS BY
LAND AND WATER
AND PLANTED
COMMONWEALTHS.

TO THE
BRAVE WOMEN
WHO IN
SOLITUDES
AMID STRANGE
DANGERS AND
HEAVY TOIL
REARED FAMILIES
AND MADE HOMES.

INSCRIPTIONS ON THE WATER-GATE AT THE WORLD'S FAIR, CHICAGO.
TOWARD THE COURT OF HONOR.

CIVIL LIBERTY
THE MEANS
OF BUILDING UP
PERSONAL AND
NATIONAL CHARACTER.

TO THE PIONEERS OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.
BUT BOLDER THEY WHO FIRST OFF-CAST
THEIR MOORINGS FROM THE HABITABLE PAST
AND VENTURED CHARLESS ON THE SEA
OF STORM-ENGENDERING LIBERTY.

TOLERATION
IN RELIGION
THE BEST FRUIT
OF THE LAST
FOUR CENTURIES.

YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

I FREEDOM DWELL
WITH KNOWLEDGE:
I ABIDE
WITH MEN BY
CULTURE TRAINED
AND FORTIFIED.
CONSCIENCE
MY SCEPTRE IS
AND LAW MY SWORD.

WE HERE
HIGHLY RESOLVE
THAT GOVERNMENT
OF THE PEOPLE
BY THE PEOPLE
FOR THE
PEOPLE
SHALL NOT PERISH
FROM THE EARTH.

APPENDIX E

ROBERT GOULD SHAW MONUMENT

BOSTON COMMON

BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS

1897

TO THE FIFTY FOURTH
REGIMENTOF MASSACHUSETTS
INFANTRY

THE WHITE OFFICERS

TAKING LIFE AND HONOR IN THEIR HANDS — CAST IN THEIR LOT WITH MEN OF
A DESPISED RACE UNPROVED IN WAR AND RISKED DEATH AS INCITERS OF
SERVILE INSURRECTION IF TAKEN PRISONERS — BESIDES ENCOUNTERING
ALL THE COMMON PERILS OF CAMP MARCH AND BATTLE

THE BLACK RANK AND FILE

VOLUNTEERED WHEN DISASTER CLOUDED THE UNION CAUSE — SERVED
WITHOUT PAY FOR EIGHTEEN MONTHS TILL GIVEN THAT OF WHITE TROOPS —
FACED THREATENED ENSLAVEMENT IF CAPTURED — WERE BRAVE IN ACTION —
PATIENT UNDER HEAVY AND DANGEROUS LABORS — AND CHEERFUL AMID
HARDSHIPS AND PRIVATIONS

TOGETHER

THEY GAVE TO THE NATION AND THE WORLD UNDYING PROOF THAT
AMERICANS OF AFRICAN DESCENT POSSESS THE PRIDE COURAGE AND
DEVOTION OF THE PATRIOT SOLDIER — ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND
SUCH AMERICANS ENLISTED UNDER THE UNION FLAG IN
M.D.CCCLXIII — M.D.CCCLXV.

EVACUATION MONUMENT
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
1902

ON THESE HEIGHTS
DURING THE NIGHT OF MARCH 4 1776
THE AMERICAN TROOPS BESIEGING BOSTON
BUILT TWO REDOUBTS
WHICH MADE THE HARBOR AND TOWN
UNTENABLE BY THE BRITISH FLEET AND GARRISON.
ON MARCH 17 THE BRITISH FLEET
CARRYING 11000 EFFECTIVE MEN
AND 1000 REFUGEES
DROPPED DOWN TO NANTASKET ROADS
AND THENCEFORTH
BOSTON WAS FREE.
A STRONG BRITISH FORCE
HAD BEEN EXPELLED
FROM ONE OF THE UNITED AMERICAN COLONIES.

INSCRIPTIONS — POST OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It is well known that the inscriptions which Eliot composed for the East and West pavilions of the Post Office in Washington were revised by Woodrow Wilson, then President. Mr. Edward H. Cotton gives the following as Eliot's draft:

CARRIER OF NEWS AND KNOWLEDGE
INSTRUMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE
PROMOTER OF MUTUAL ACQUAINTANCE
AMONG MEN AND NATIONS AND HENCE
OF PEACE AND GOOD WILL.

CARRIER OF LOVE AND SYMPATHY
MESSENGER OF FRIENDSHIP
CONSOLER OF THE LONELY
SERVANT OF THE SCATTERED FAMILY
ENLARGER OF THE PUBLIC LIFE.

The revised inscriptions read:

CARRIER OF NEWS AND KNOWLEDGE
INSTRUMENT OF TRADE AND
PROMOTER OF MUTUAL ACQUAINTANCE
OF PEACE AND GOOD-WILL
AMONG MEN AND NATIONS.

MESSENGER OF SYMPATHY AND LOVE
SERVANT OF PARTED FRIENDS
CONSOLER OF THE LONELY
BOND OF THE SCATTERED FAMILY
ENLARGER OF THE COMMON LIFE.

APPENDIX F

THE FIVE-FOOT BOOK-SHELF

FOLLOWING are the contents of the volumes shown (incompletely) by their titles:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Vol. 1 | Benjamin Franklin, John Woolman, William Penn. |
| Vol. 2 | Plato, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius. |
| Vol. 3 | Bacon, Milton's Prose, Thomas Browne. |
| Vol. 4 | Complete Poems in English, Milton. |
| Vol. 5 | Essays and English Traits, Emerson. |
| Vol. 6 | Poems and Songs, Burns. |
| Vol. 7 | The Confessions of St. Augustine, The Imitation of Christ. |
| Vol. 8 | Nine Greek Dramas. |
| Vol. 9 | Letters and Treatises of Cicero and Pliny. |
| Vol. 10 | Wealth of Nations, Adam Smith. |
| Vol. 11 | Origin of Species, Darwin. |
| Vol. 12 | Plutarch's Lives. |
| Vol. 13 | Æneid, Virgil. |
| Vol. 14 | Don Quixote, Part I, Cervantes. |
| Vol. 15 | Pilgrim's Progress, Donne and Herbert, Walton. |
| Vol. 16 | The Thousand and One Nights. |
| Vol. 17 | Folk-Lore and Fable, Æsop, Grimm, Andersen. |
| Vol. 18 | Modern English Drama. |
| Vol. 19 | Faust, Egmont, etc., Goethe, Doctor Faustus, Marlowe. |
| Vol. 20 | The Divine Comedy, Dante. |
| Vol. 21 | I Promessi Sposi, Manzoni. |
| Vol. 22 | The Odyssey, Homer. |
| Vol. 23 | Two Years Before the Mast, Dana. |
| Vol. 24 | On the Sublime, French Revolution, etc., Burke. |
| Vol. 25 | J. S. Mill and Thomas Carlyle. |
| Vol. 26 | Continental Drama. |
| Vol. 27 | English Essays, Sidney to Macaulay. |
| Vol. 28 | Essays, English and American. |

- Vol. 29 Voyage of the Beagle, Darwin.
Vol. 30 Faraday, Helmholtz, Kelvin, Newcomb, etc.
Vol. 31 Autobiography, Cellini.
Vol. 32 Montaigne, Sainte-Beuve, Renan, etc.
Vol. 33 Voyages and Travels.
Vol. 34 Descartes, Voltaire, Rousseau, Hobbes.
Vol. 35 Froissart, Malory, Holinshed.
Vol. 36 Machiavelli, More, Luther.
Vol. 37 Locke, Berkeley, Hume.
Vol. 38 Harvey, Jenner, Lister, Pasteur.
Vol. 39 Famous Prefaces.
Vol. 40-42 English Poetry, 3 vols.
Vol. 43 American Historical Documents.
Vol. 44-45 Sacred Writings, 2 vols.
Vol. 46-47 Elizabethan Drama, 2 vols.
Vol. 48 Thoughts and Minor Works, Pascal.
Vol. 49 Epic and Saga.
Vol. 50 Introduction, Reader's Guide, Indexes.

APPENDIX G

HONORS CONFERRED UPON CHARLES W. ELIOT

- 1857 Fellow American Academy of Arts and Sciences
- 1869 LL.D. Williams College
- 1869 LL.D. Princeton University
- 1870 LL.D. Yale University
- 1871 Member American Philosophical Society
- 1873 Member Massachusetts Historical Society
- 1902 LL.D. Johns Hopkins University
- 1903 Officer Legion of Honor (France)
- 1904 Corresponding Member Academy Moral and Political Science,
Institute of France
- 1908 Grand Officer of the Crown of Italy
- 1909 LL.D. Tulane University
- 1909 LL.D. University of Missouri
- 1909 LL.D. Dartmouth College
- 1909 LL.D. Harvard University
- 1909 M.D. (hon.) Harvard University
- 1909 Imperial Order of the Rising Sun, 1st class, Japan
- 1909 Royal Prussian Order of the Crown, 1st class
- 1909 Fellow Royal Society of Literature (England)
- 1911 Ph.D. (hon.) University of Breslau
- 1914 LL.D. Brown University
- 1914 Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy
- 1919 Order of the Crown of Belgium
- 1923 Grand Cordon of the Order of St. Sava, Serbia
- 1923 Civic Forum Medal of Honor, New York
- 1923 LL.D. Boston University
- 1924 Roosevelt Medal for Distinguished Service
- 1924 Commander of the Legion of Honor (France)
- 1924 LL.D. University of the State of New York

APPENDIX H

PORTRAITS OF CHARLES W. ELIOT

Artist: William Page. Presented to Harvard College in 1876 by members of the Class of 1853. Three-quarters length, standing figure, in academic gown. Head turned slightly to his right.

Artist: Robert Gordon Hardie. 1890. Property of the University Club of New York City. Full face; full-length seated, in academic gown. A copy of this portrait, three-quarters length, is in the Harvard Club of New York.

Artist: Charles S. Hopkinson. 1905 or 1906. Half-length, three-quarters face turned to his right. In the possession of Mr. Ernest B. Dane, Brookline, Mass.

Artist: John Singer Sargent. 1907. Full-length figure, in academic gown, standing at the bottom of a flight of broad stone steps, with body and head facing forward. Presented to the Trustees of the Harvard Union by subscription from students and various Harvard clubs. Eliot sat for this portrait while on a visit to London. Sargent wanted to paint him in his presidential gown, but the gown could not be obtained until after Eliot left London, and photographs that were sent to Sargent did not supply him with the background that he thought he could use. The body was therefore painted from a model. The background was invented by the painter.

Artist: Denman W. Ross. 1909. Three-quarters length standing figure, in academic gown. Face turned slightly to his left. Presented by the artist to Harvard College.

Artist: Louis Potter. 1909. A marble bust, head and shoulders. Academic gown. In the possession of Harvard College.

Artist: Arthur Pope. 1924. Full-length; sitting; three-quarters face turned to his right; in presidential robe. Property of Mrs. John W. Riddle.

APPENDIX I

SOURCES

THE Annual Reports of the President of Harvard College, with annexed documents, are an indispensable guide to an understanding of Eliot's administration.

The correspondence files of the President's office (1869-1909) are in the University Library. Eliot's executors have deposited there the files of his correspondence from 1909 to 1926. Until the nineties the official files are full of letters addressed to Eliot by other people and contain few copies of his own letters. After that date record copies of his letters increase in number, but it seems that his practice was to keep copies of only a small proportion of what went out from the President's office.

There is also in the Harvard Library a collection of "Articles and Addresses" containing things that were published in magazine or pamphlet form, newspaper clippings, and manuscripts or mere manuscript notes.

The biographies of men and women who were connected with Harvard or were much in Boston from 1854 until Eliot's death usually contain some references to him or to Harvard matters with which he was closely identified. Some of these contain letters to or from him.

Mr. S. E. Morison's "Development of Harvard University 1869 to 1929," Harvard University Press (1930), deserves special mention.

The Files of the "Harvard Graduates' Magazine" (beginning in 1892) contain University news and current discussion. The issues for June, 1894, March, 1909, and December, 1926 contain valuable articles about Eliot and his administration as President of Harvard.

Without attempting to give a full list of references to what has been written about C. W. Eliot, I would mention what follows.

Two autobiographical statements. (See items, 1911-1 and 1913-1 under Group II in Appendix J.)

For genealogical information, see *Eliot Genealogy*, by Walter G. Eliot (New York, 1887); *Samuel Eliot*, by Anna Eliot Ticknor (Boston, 1869); Samuel A. Eliot, in A. P. Peabody's *Harvard Graduates I Have*

Known (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1890); "C. W. Eliot," by Alfred Johnson, *New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.* LXXXI, 3 (1927); and correction in *ibid.*, LXXXII, 354, footnote

Babbitt, Irving, "President Eliot and American Education," *Forum* LXXXI (1929), 1.

Briggs, LeB. R., "As Seen by a Disciple," *Atlantic Monthly*, Nov., 1929.
Chapman, J. J., "A Happy Warrior," review of Neilson's *Charles W. Eliot, the Man, and his Beliefs*, in *The Yale Review*, Vol. XVI, July, 1927, pp. 783-786; and "President Eliot" in *Memories and Milestones*, Moffatt Yard, 1915.

Cotton, Edward H., *Life of Charles W. Eliot* (Small, Maynard, 1926).
Emerton, Ephraim, "Personal Recollections of Charles William Eliot," *Harv. Grad. Mag.*, XXXII (1924), 342.

Grandgent, C. H., *The New Word*, last chapter. (Harvard University Press, 1929.)

Hart, A. B., "Charles William Eliot, Educator of the Community," *Massachusetts Commonwealth History*, v, chap. x (1930).

Howe, M. A. DeW., "The Harvard Figure of Charles William Eliot," in *Classic Shades*. (Little, Brown, 1928.)

Hyde, W. DeW., "President Eliot as an Educational Reformer" (1899), *Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1899; and "A Great College President," in *The College Man and the College Woman*. (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1906.)

Kuehnemann, Eugen, *Charles W. Eliot*. (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.)

Neilson, W. A., Introduction to *Charles W. Eliot, The Man and his Beliefs*. (Harper, 1926.) (This collection of essays and addresses is an admirable and convenient record of his thought. For contents see item M, Group I, Appendix J.)

Peabody, F. G., Chapter on Eliot, in *Reminiscences of Present Day Saints*. (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927.)

Perry, Ralph Barton, Article on C. W. Eliot in the *Dictionary of American Biography*. (I have been allowed to see this in manuscript.)

Richards, Theodore, "Charles William Eliot," in *Later Years of the Saturday Club*. (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927.)

Saunderson, Henry Hallam, *Charles W. Eliot, Puritan Liberal*. (Harper, 1928.)

Sullivan, Mark, "Personality of President Eliot." *Outlook*, August 6, 1904.

Thwing, C. F., *Guides, Philosophers and Friends*, chap. 1 (Macmillan, 1927); and "President Eliot's Twenty-Five Years of Service," in *Forum*, xvii (1894), 255.

Wendell, Barrett, "De Praesede Magnifico," in *Mystery of Education*. (Scribner's, 1909.)

The Ninetieth Birthday of Charles William Eliot. Proceedings in Sanders Theatre and the Yard, March 20, 1924. Harvard University Press, 1925.

APPENDIX J

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ELIOT'S PRINCIPAL WRITINGS

GROUP I

IN this group are listed books, as distinguished from single articles which are enumerated under Group II. Books that contain several items of Group II have the key numbers of such items given in parentheses.

A Manual of Inorganic Chemistry, Arranged to Facilitate the Experimental Demonstration of the Facts and Principles of the Science. By C. W. Eliot and F. H. Storer. Printed for the authors by Rockwell and Rollins; Boston, 1867.

A Compendious Manual of Qualitative Chemical Analysis. By C. W. Eliot and F. H. Storer. Van Nostrand; 1869.

- A. *American Contributions to Civilization.* The Century Co., 1897. (1896-4; 1894-1; 1888-3; 1890-3; 1890-2; 1896-3; 1891-2; 1892-3; 1877-1; 1895-1; 1888-1; 1896-1; 1893-1; 1874-1; 1880-1; 1886-1; 1896-6; 1896-7.)
- B. *Educational Reform.* The Century Co., 1898. (1869-2; 1876-1; 1879-1; 1883-1; 1884-1; 1885-1; 1888-2; 1890-1; 1890-4; 1891-1; 1892-1; 1892-2; 1893-2; 1894-2; 1896-8; 1896-2; 1896-3; 1897-1.)
Charles Eliot, Landscape Architect. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1902. (The last pages are reprinted in M.)
- C. *Four American Leaders.* American Unitarian Association, 1906. (1906-1; 1903-1; 1903-2; 1903-6.)
- D. *University Administration.* Houghton Mifflin Company, 1908. (A Series of Lectures delivered at Northwestern University.)
- E. *Education for Efficiency.* Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909. (1904-3; 1915-6.)
- F. *The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism In a Democracy.* (Barbour Page Lectures delivered at the University of Virginia, 1909.) Scribner's, 1910. (1909-4; 1909-2; 1909-3.)

- G. *The Durable Satisfactions of Life*. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1910. (1905-3; 1895-1; 1899-1; 1906-2; 1909-8.)
- H. *The Future of Trades-Unionism and Capitalism in a Democracy*. Putnam's, 1910. (1909-2; 1909-3.)
The Harvard Classics, edited by C. W. Eliot. (The "Five-Foot Book-Shelf" — fifty-one volumes.) P. F. Collier & Sons, 1910.
Some Roads Toward Peace; A Report on Observations Made in China and Japan in 1912. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Washington, 1913.
- I. *The Road Toward Peace*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915. New and enlarged edition. (1907-4; 1907-5; 1910-2; 1914-4; 1915-4; 1915-7; 1915-8; 1902-2; 1902-1.) Contains also twelve chapters made up of extracts from *Some Roads Toward Peace* (the Report to the Carnegie Endowment); and from letters about the war written to the *New York Times* during 1914 and 1915; a correspondence with Jacob Schiff; and a Speech on America's Duty Respecting the War.
- J. *The Training For An Effective Life*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915. (1905-6; 1912-1; 1904-4; 1906-4; 1907-2; 1909-1; 1903-5.)
- K. *Harvard Memories*. Harvard University Press, 1923. (1922-4; 1922-1; 1922-2.)
- L. *A Late Harvest*. The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1924. (1914-2; 1917-3; 1919-1; 1920-2; 1920-1; 1917-5; 1914-5; 1914-1; 1917-2; 1915-7; 1921-3; 1921-1; 1917-7; 1917-6; 1921-2; 1914-7; 1917-1; 1921-4; 1916-1; 1919-2; 1923-2; 1922-3.) Also a letter to the *Boston Herald* on "Public Opinion about Strikes."
- M. *Charles W. Eliot, The Man and His Beliefs*. Harper, 1926. 2 vols. A collection of essays and addresses edited with an introduction by William Allan Neilson. (1869-2; 1884-1; 1891-1; 1897-1; 1905-4; 1906-3; 1908-4; 1908-1; 1904-3; 1903-4; 1911-4; 1911-5; 1904-2; 1909-3; 1909-2; 1913-4; 1923-1; 1913-2; 1915-8; 1915-1; 1915-4; 1915-2; 1895-1; 1899-1; 1906-1; 1903-6; 1903-1; 1903-2; 1904-4; 1906-4; 1905-3; 1905-2; 1908-2; 1909-4; 1906-2; 1911-3; 1913-3; 1874-1; 1896-5;

1896-4; 1907-1; 1911-2.) And the last pages of the volume called *Charles Eliot*, under the title "The Character of Charles Eliot."

- N. *Charles W. Eliot's Talks to Parents and Young People*. Edited by Edward H. Cotton. The Beacon Press, 1928. (1914-1; 1917-2; 1918-2; 1917-8; "The Policy of Silence" (undated); 1914-5; 1908-1; 1908-6; 1915-3; 1908-7; "Self-Control" (undated); 1905-6; 1907-3; 1912-1;) "A Religion for Youth" (undated).

GROUP II

In this group are listed essays and addresses which were published in periodicals, the proceedings of societies, or in pamphlet form. Some have been reprinted in several forms. Such of them as are to be found in the volume of collections listed in Group I, are followed by the key letters of the items of that group in which they are to be found.

This bibliography does not pretend to be complete. It is merely a reference list to the more notable of Eliot's utterances.

1860

1. The Impurities of Commercial Zinc. Communicated by C. W. Eliot and F. H. Storer to *Memoirs of Am. Acad. of Arts and Sci.* N.S., VIII, 57-96. (May, 1860.) (See also footnote to page 103, vol. I.)

1869

1. The New Education. Its Organization. *Atlantic Monthly*, February and March, 1869.
2. Inaugural address of Dr. Eliot. At Cambridge, October 19, 1869. (B.M.)

1873

1. A National University. Report made by Charles W. Eliot to the National Education Association, Aug. 5, 1873. *Addresses and Proceedings, Nat. Educ. Ass'n.* (1873), 107.

1874

1. The Exemption from Taxation of Church Property, and the Property of Educational, Literary, and Charitable Institutions.

Address to the Commissioners of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Dec. 12, 1874. (A; M.)

1876

1. Address at the Inauguration of Daniel C. Gilman as President of Johns Hopkins University. At Baltimore, Feb. 22, 1876. (E.)

1877

1. Three Results of the Scientific Study of Nature. Address at the opening of the New Building of the American Museum of Natural History. New York, Dec. 22, 1877. (A.)

1879

1. Teachers' Tenure of Office. At Massachusetts Teachers' Association, Dec. 30, 1879. (B.)

1880

1. The Future of The New England Churches. Address delivered at the 250th Anniversary of the First Church. At Boston, 1880. (A.)

1883

1. On The Education of Ministers. *Princeton Review*, May, 1883. (B.)

1884

1. What Is a Liberal Education? At Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Feb. 22, 1884. *Century Magazine*, June, 1884. (B; M.)

1885

1. Liberty in Education. Address Before the Nineteenth Century Club, New York, 1885. (B.)

1886

1. Why We Honor the Puritans. Address at the Celebration of the 250th Anniversary of the First Parish Church in Cambridge, Feb. 12, 1886. (A.)

1888

1. A Happy Life: A Tribute to Asa Gray. American Academy of Arts & Sciences, June 13, 1888. (A.)
2. Can School Programmes Be Shortened and Enriched? At Meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association, Washington, Feb. 16, 1888. (B.)
3. The Working of the American Democracy. Phi Beta Kappa Oration, Cambridge, June 28, 1888. (A.)

1890

1. An Average Massachusetts Grammar School. Address at The Massachusetts Teachers' Association, Nov. 28, 1890. (B.)
2. Family Stocks in a Democracy. *Forum*, December, 1890. (A.)
3. The Forgotten Millions. *Century Magazine*, August, 1890. (A.)
4. The Gap Between Common Schools and Colleges. *Arena*, June, 1890. (B.)

1891

1. The Aims of the Higher Education. At Chicago, 1891. (B; M.)
2. One Remedy For Municipal Misgovernment. *Forum*, October, 1891. (A.)

1892

1. Shortening and Enriching the Grammar-School Course. Paper read before the National Educational Association, Brooklyn, Feb. 16, 1892. (B.)
2. Undesirable and Desirable Uniformity in Schools. National Educational Association, Saratoga, July 12, 1892. (B.)
3. Wherein Popular Education Has Failed. *Forum*, December, 1892. (A.)

1893

1. Present Disadvantages of Rich Men. Speech at the Unitarian Club, Boston, January, 1893. (A.)
2. The Grammar School of the Future. Massachusetts State Teachers' Association, December, 1893. (B.)

1894

1. Some Reasons Why the American Republic May Endure. *Forum*, October, 1894. (A.)
2. The Unity of Educational Reform. Paper read before the American Institute of Instruction at Bethlehem, New Hampshire, July 11, 1894. *Educational Review*, October, 1894. (B.)

1895

1. The Happy Life. Address at the Woman's College of Baltimore, Nov. 7, 1895. (A; G; M.)

1896

1. A Republican Gentleman; A Tribute to Martin Brimmer. Read at the Massachusetts Historical Society, Feb. 13, 1896. (A.)
2. A Wider Range of Electives In College Admission Requirements. Harvard Teachers' Association, Mar. 7, 1896. *Educational Review*, May, 1896. (B.)
3. An Urban University. Dedication of the New Grounds of Columbia University, New York, May, 1896. (E.)
4. Equality in A Republic. *Cambridge Magazine*, May, 1896. (A; M.)
5. Five American Contributions to Civilization. At Chautauqua, Aug., 1896. *Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1896. (A; M.)
6. Heroes of the Civil War. Address in Memorial Hall, Harvard University, May 30, 1896. (A.)
7. International Arbitration. Speech at the American Conference on International Arbitration, Washington, April, 1896. (A.)
8. Medical Education of the Future. Address before the Medical Society of the State of New York, Jan. 28, 1896. *American Medico-Surgical Bulletin*, Feb. 1, 1896.

1897

1. The Function of Education in Democratic Society. Brooklyn Institute, Oct. 2, 1897. *Outlook*, Nov. 6, 1897. (B; M.).

1898

1. The Liquor Problem in its Legislative Aspects. By Frederic H. Wines and John Koren. An investigation made under the direction of C. W. Eliot, Seth Low, and James C. Carter. (Contains an introduction entitled "Liquor Problem" written by C. W. Eliot, Seth Low, and James C. Carter.) Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1898.

1899

1. John Gilley: Maine Farmer and Fisherman. American Unitarian Association, 1904. *Century Magazine*, November, 1899. (The Forgotten Millions, II. John Gilley). (M; G.)

1902

1. Address At a Banquet Given By the City of Boston to Prince Henry of Prussia. March 6, 1902. (I.)
2. Address Made On the Occasion of the Conferring of The Degree of Doctor of Laws on Prince Henry of Prussia, March 6, 1902, in Sanders Theatre. *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, June, 1902. (I.)

1903

1. Channing. Address made at the unveiling of the Channing statue on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of William Ellery Channing, Boston, June 1, 1903. (C; M.)
2. Emerson. An address delivered on the commemoration of the centenary of the birth of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Boston, May 24, 1903. *Atlantic Monthly*, June, 1903. (C; M.)
3. More Money for the Public Schools. Doubleday, Page Co., 1903.
4. The New Definition of the Cultivated Man. Address delivered before the National Educational Association, Boston, July 6, 1903. (D; M.)
5. The Service of Universities to a Democracy. At the Dinner of the Associated Harvard Clubs at St. Louis, Dec. 5, 1903. (J.)
6. Washington. An address given before the Union League Club

of Chicago at the exercises in commemoration of the birth of Washington, Feb. 23, 1903. (C; M.)

1904

1. A Good Urban School Organization. Address before the Association, Jan. 16, 1904. *Independent*, Feb. 25, 1904. *Teacher*. March, 1904.
2. Content in Work. *World's Work*, July, 1904. (M.)
3. Education for Efficiency. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909. An address before the Harvard Summer School, Aug. 8, 1904. *Journal of Pedagogy*, December, 1904. (E; M.)
4. The Character of a Gentleman. Address at The Harvard Union, Oct. 12, 1904. (J; M.)

1905

1. Massachusetts: An Old and Prosperous Democracy and a Safe Social Order. Hingham, Mass.: The Village Press, 1905.
2. The Appreciation of Beauty. Delivered at the opening of the Albright Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y., May 31, 1905. *Critic*, August, 1905. (M.)
3. The Durable Satisfaction of Life. Address given to new students, Harvard University, Oct. 3, 1905. (G; M. — And under the title "The Solid Satisfaction of Life" in *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, December, 1905; and in J; N.)
4. The Evils of College Football. From President's Annual Report for 1903-04. *Woman's Home Companion*, November, 1905. (M.)
5. The Liquor Problem: A Summary of Investigations Conducted by The Committee of Fifty, 1893-1903. Prepared for the Committee by John S. Billings, Charles W. Eliot, Henry W. Farnham, Jacob L. Greene, and Francis G. Peabody. Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1905.

1906

1. Franklin as Printer and Philosopher. Address delivered before a meeting of the American Philosophical Society to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, Philadelphia, April 20, 1906. Lancaster, Pa: The New Era Printing Co., 1906. *Science*, June 1, 1906. (C; M.)
2. Great Riches. Address at Bridgeport, Connecticut, Nov. 14,

1906. Thomas P. Crowell & Co., 1906. *World's Work*, April, 1906. (G; M.)
3. The Character of the Scientific Investigator. Address delivered at the formal opening of the Laboratories of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, May 11, 1906. *Educational Review*, September, 1906. (M.)
 4. The Freedom to Choose. Address given to new students at the Harvard Union, Oct. 1, 1906. (J; M.)

1907

1. City Government by Fewer Men. *World's Work*, October, 1907. (M.)
2. Foresight and Capacity for Strenuous Effort. Address to new students at the Harvard Union, Oct. 9, 1907. (J.)
3. Rational College Sports. *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, March, 1907.
4. The Competitive Arming of the Nations — A Way of Escape. Address before the Canadian Club of Ottawa, Feb. 23, 1907. (I.)
5. Is Force the Rightful Ruler? At Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, May, 1907. (I.)
6. Untimely Peace Proposals. At Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, May, 1907. (I.)

1908

1. The Higher Education for Women. 1908. *Harper's Bazaar*, June, 1908. (M; N.)
2. The Intellectual Life of Women. *Ladies' Home Journal*, January, 1908. (M.)
3. The Part of the Man in the Family. *Ladies' Home Journal*, March, 1908.

1909

1. Preparation for an Effective Life. Address at Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. Jan. 16, 1909. (J.)
2. The Contemporary American Conception of Equality Among Men as a Social and Political Ideal. Phi Beta Kappa oration at the University of Missouri, June 2, 1909. Columbia: The University, 1909.

3. The Future of Capitalism in a Democracy. Lecture at Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, October, 1909. (H; M.)
4. The Future of Trades-Unionism in a Democracy. Lecture at Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, October, 1909. (H; M.)
5. The Religion of the Future. Address July 22, 1909, before the Harvard Summer School of Theology. *Harvard Theological Review*, October, 1909, New York, F. A. Stokes, 1909; Boston, J. W. Luce & Co., 1909. (G; M.)

1910

1. Introduction to Herbert Spencer's *Essays on Education and Kindred Subjects*, in Everyman's Library. Dutton, 1911.
2. The Fears Which Cause the Increasing Armaments. At Lake Mohonk Conference, May, 1910. (I.)

1911

1. Contributions to the History of American Teaching, vii. (Consists largely of Eliot's account of his own education.) *Educational Review*, XLII (1911), 346.
2. Civil Service Reform, and Popular Government. New York: National Civil Service Reform League, 1912. Address delivered at 31st annual meeting of the Nat. Civ. Ref. League, Philadelphia, 1911. (M.)
3. Democracy and Manners. *Century Magazine*, December, 1911. (M.)
4. The Religious Ideal in Education. At the Old South Church, Boston, April 2, 1911. *Outlook*, October 21, 1911. (M.)
5. The University President in the American Commonwealth. *Educational Review*, December, 1911. (M.)

1912

1. Looking Ahead in Life. Address to the Class of 1916. Harvard Union, September 26, 1912. *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, December, 1912. (J; N.)
2. William Watson Goodwin. At meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society, October, 1912. Boston, 1913. (Reprinted from the *Proceedings*, October, 1912, pp. 15-22.)

1913

1. Autobiographical Sketch. In *Report of the Harvard Class of 1853, 1849-1913. Issued on the Sixtieth Anniversary for the Use of the Class and Its Friends*. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Reprinted in *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, xxxv, 224 (December, 1926).
2. Present and Future Causes of War, Especially in the Orient. Report to the Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in 1913. (I; M.)
3. Public Opinion and Sex Hygiene. In: International Congress on School Hygiene, 4. Buffalo, 1913. *Transactions*. Buffalo, 1914. Vol. 5, pp. 400-408. (M.)
4. Successful Profit-Sharing. *System*, August, 1913. (M.)
5. The Tendency to the Concrete and Practical in Modern Education. At Massachusetts Teachers' Association, 1913. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913.

1914

1. Bringing Up A Boy. *Delineator*, October, 1914. (L; N.)
2. How I Have Kept My Health and Working Power Till Eighty. *The Ladies' Home Journal*, April, 1914. (L.)
3. The Crying Need of a Renewed Christianity. Address delivered under the auspices of the Unitarian churches of Philadelphia, Dec. 29, 1914. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1914.
4. The Pilgrims' Ideals — A Free Church In a Free State in 1620. Address on Forefathers' Day, 1914, before the New England Society of New York. (I.)
5. The Woman That Will Survive. *Delineator*, July, 1914. (L; N.)

1915

1. An International Force Must Support an International Tribunal. American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes; No. 19 (1915). (M.)
2. How Can America Best Contribute Toward Constructive and Durable Peace? *Annals of the American Academy for Social and Political Science*, September, 1915. (M.)
3. Husbands and Fathers. *Delineator*, January, 1915.

4. National Efficiency Best Developed Under Free Government. Address at Harvard Club of Boston Jan. 15, 1915. (I; M.)
5. The Changes Needed in American Secondary Education. Paper read in the conference on education of the Second Pan-American Scientific Congress, at Washington, Dec. 27, 1915. New York: General Education Board, 1916.
6. The Cultivated Man. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915. (E.)
7. The Hopes for the Future of Europe. 1915. Speech at Lake Mohonk Conference, May 20, 1915. (I.)
8. The Moral Effects of War. Memorial Day address delivered in Sanders Theatre, Harvard University, May 31, 1915. *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, June 2, 1915. (I; M.)

1916

1. What Is An American? *Collier's Weekly*, Aug. 12, 1916. (L.)

1917

1. A Free and Open Christian Church. Address at Symphony Hall, Boston, Feb. 4, 1917. *Christian Register*, Feb. 15, 1917. (L.)
2. Advantages of Poor Men's Sons. *Delineator*, January, 1917. (L; N.)
3. Epes Sargent Dixwell. Boston Latin School *Register*, February, 1917. (L.)
4. Latin and the A.B. Degree. General Education Board, 1917 (Occasional papers No. 5). See also *Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1917: "The Case Against Compulsory Latin."
5. The Agassiz House on Quincy Street. *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, March 29, 1917. (L.)
6. The Future of Medicine. Speech at Harvard Medical Alumni Dinner, May 12, 1917. *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, October 25, 1917. (L.)
7. The Road to Industrial Peace. *Nation's Business*, August, 1917. (L.)
8. The Small Family. *Delineator*, March, 1917.

1918

1. Certain Defects in American Education and the Remedies for Them. Washington: U.S. Bureau of Education, 1918. (Teacher's Leaflet No. 5.)
2. The Most Promising Student Seen in Fifty Years of Teaching. *American Boy*, December, 1918. (Under title of "The Most Interesting Boy I Ever Knew.")

1919

1. James Russell Lowell as a Professor. Address delivered at a celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Lowell, by the Cambridge Historical Society, Cambridge, Feb. 22, 1919. *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, June, 1919. (L.)
2. Zionism. *Maccabean*, August, 1919. (L.)

1920

1. Langdell and the Law School. *Harvard Law Review*, February, 1920. (L.)
2. Oliver Wendell Holmes. Address to the Harvard Medical Society, Nov. 1920. *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, June, 1923. (L.)

1921

1. American Education Since the Civil War. Address prepared for the sixth commencement at Houston, Texas, June 6, 1921. *Rice Institute Pamphlet*, Vol. IX, No. 1. (L.)
2. Present and Future Social Hygiene in America. *International Journal of Public Health*, January and February 1921. (L.)
3. Protection Against Ignorance. *Nation's Business*, February 1921. (L.)
4. The Joyful Duty of the Layman to the Modern Church in the Worship of God and the Service of Man. Sermon delivered on Laymen's Sunday, in the First Parish in Cambridge. *Christian Register*, December, 1921. (L.)

1922

1. The Function of a University. *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, June 22, 1922. (K.)

2. The Harvard Yard and Buildings. Remarks before the Schools of Architecture and of Landscape Architecture, Harvard University, Dec. 14, 1922. (K.)
3. The Next American Contribution to Civilization. *Foreign Affairs*, September 1922. (L.)
4. The Traditions of Harvard College. Remarks to a meeting of foreign students. *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, March 16, 1922. (K.)
5. Thomas Hopkinson: New Englander (1804-1856). A memoir by Leslie W. Hopkinson with an Introduction by C. W. E. Privately printed, 1922, by the Rufus H. Darby Printing Co., Washington, D.C.

1923

1. Closed Shop or Open. Address before the Society of Harvard Dames in Phillips Brooks House, Cambridge, Oct. 25, 1923. *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, Dec. 13, 1923.
2. Prohibition. Address before the Economic Club of Boston, Boston, March 6, 1923. *Consensus*, April, 1923. (L.)

1925

1. Benjamin Peirce, 1809-1880. Reminiscences by President-Emeritus Eliot. *American Mathematical Monthly*, January 1925.

INDEX

- Abbot, Edwin H., letter of Eliot to, II, 48
- Adams, Charles Francis, 1st, refuses Presidency of Harvard College, I, 191, 192; approves of reforms in Medical School, 287, 288
- Adams, Charles Francis, 2nd, quoted on Boston Latin School, I, 16; quoted on Harvard College in the fifties, 215; assists in circulating paper of Eliot on national university, 325 n.; on cost of Spanish War, II, 107; his despondency, 238, 248; and Eliot, 241
Letters from: Eliot, C. W., II, 151, 163, 238
- Adams, Henry, on New England boys, I, 22; made assistant professor, 254, 256, 306
- Adams, John Quincy, student in Harvard College, I, 36; Fellow of Harvard College (1878), 301
- Admission requirements. *See* College-entrance requirements
- Agassiz, Alexander, I, 80, 83, 194; Fellow of Harvard College (1878), 301; II, 10
Letter from: Eliot, C. W., II, 34
- Agassiz, Louis, I, 194, 275; II, 13, 311; supports Wolcott Gibbs for Rumford Professorship, I, 102, 107, 111, 112; his views for development of Harvard College, 186; his college work, 210, 219, 220
- Allen, F. W., II, 320 n.
- American Academy of Arts and Sciences, awards medal to Eliot, II, 305
- American legislation, II, 234
- Ames, Fisher, declines Presidency of Harvard College, I, 191
- Ames, James Barr, appointment in Law School, I, 255, 256, 269; II, 63
- Amherst College, entrance requirements of, I, 367; table of teaching staff, electives, and university enrollment in, in 1868-69, II, 343
- Amory, William, I, 10
- Andrew, Gov. John A., I, 180
- Aniline colors, processes of making, I, 146
- Apprentice system in medical schools, I, 277
- Arcachon, I, 176
- Arnold, Matthew, I, 331
- Asticou Mountain, II, 243
- Astronomical Laboratory, Harvard, I, 293
- Athletics, II, 67-71
- Atkins, Catherine, wife of Samuel Eliot, I, 8, 9
- Atkinson, W. P., letter to Eliot, I, 96
"Atlantic Monthly," articles on the New Education in, I, 166-71, 196, 196 n., 203
- Bachelor of Arts, degree of, I, 210; II, 83.
See also Degrees
- Bachelor of Civil Law, degree of, I, 245.
See also Degrees
- Bachelor of Science, degree of, I, 210, 295; II, 64. *See also* Degrees
- Bancroft, George, I, 216
- Bancroft, Mrs. H. H., letter of Eliot to, II, 115
- Barlow, Francis C., member of A. A. Φ., I, 42
- Barnard, F. A. P., President of Columbia University, I, 206-08, 221; his Annual Reports, 299
- Beers, Clifford C., II, 187
- Belknap, Jeremy, historian and minister of Federal Street Church, I, 6
- Bell, Alexander, II, 100, 101
- Bellows, Rev. Dr. H. W., marries Anna Peabody, I, 334
- Bendelari, George, II, 79
- Bernstorff, Baron von, II, 141
- Bigelow, Dr. Henry J., of Harvard Medical School, his opposition to reform, I, 278-86, 304; Eliot's tribute to, 287 n.; later reference to, by Eliot, 314
- Bigelow, William Sturgis, letter of Eliot to, II, 314
- Bird, Mrs. Charles Sumner, letter of Eliot to, II, 298
- Boat race of 1858, I, 79-85
- Bôcher, Ferdinand, I, 250; made Professor of Foreign Languages, 254
- Boer War, the, II, 123, 124
- Boston, of the middle of the nineteenth century, I, 30-32. *See also* Boston Common; Sundays in Boston

- Boston Academy of Music, I, 28
 Boston Common, I, 14, 19, 20, 24, 27
 Boston Latin School, I, 16, 17
 Boston Latin School Association, address of Eliot before, I, 17
 Boston Museum of Fine Arts, II, 185
 Boston Provident Association, I, 28
 Boston University, entrance requirements of, I, 367
 Botanic Garden, Harvard, I, 293
 Bowditch, Henry P., appointment to Medical School, I, 255; becomes Dean of Medical School, II, 63
 Bowen, Prof. Francis, I, 250
 Boyce, Captain, I, 26
 Brenner's Island, I, 340
 Briggs, L. B. R., quoted, II, 67 *n.*; references to, 69, 76, 307; member of Committee on Instruction in the College, 143 *n.*
 Letters from: Eliot, C. W., II, 134, 144
 Bright, John, his oratory, II, 137
 Brimmer, Martin, Fellow of Harvard College (1878), I, 301
 British rule in the East, II, 219-23
 Broad Street riots, I, 27
 Brodrick, G. C., I, 331
 Brooks, John Graham, and Eliot, I, 329, 330
 Brooks, Phillips, member of A. A. Φ., I, 42; declines invitation to become Preacher and Professor at Harvard, 373, 374; urges abolishment of compulsory chapel, 382
 Brown, Dr. John, I, 332
 Brown, Rollo Walter, quoted, II, 110, 111; anecdote told by, 326 *n.*
 Brown University, neglect of economic science in, I, 358; entrance requirements of, 367
 Brush, George J., of Department of Philosophy and Arts at Yale, I, 221; in Springfield conference, 223; references to, 297, 297 *n.*, 319; an adviser of Eliot, 308
 Letters from: Eliot, C. W., I, 162, 200, 248, 249; II, 297 *n.*
 Letter to: Whitney, J. D., I, 111
 Bryan, William J., II, 229
 Bryce, James, I, 314, 331; II, 234; his "The American Commonwealth," 50, 51; a degree for, 51; his friendship with Eliot, 247; his "Modern Democracies," 266, 282, 284; his "Memories of Travel," 303, 304
 Letters from: Eliot, C. W., II, 51, 120, 123, 248, 249, 253, 260, 262, 263, 266, 270, 272, 273, 276, 279 (three), 280, 281, 282, 284, 286
 Bryce, Lady, letters of Eliot to, II, 303, 306, 329
 Burnham, Daniel, II, 110
 Business Administration, Graduate School of, II, 224 *n.*
 Butler, Gov. Benjamin F., II, 106
 Butler, Nicholas Murray, his "Is America Worth Saving?" II, 293
 Letters from: Eliot, C. W., II, 56, 57, 219, 293
 Byerley, W. E., awarded the first Ph.D. in Mathematics at Harvard, I, 245; Member of Committee on Instruction in the College, II, 143 *n.*
 Bynner, Witter, verses of, II, 68
 Byrne, James, II, 305; elected to Harvard Corporation, 294, 295

 Cabot, Edward, his architectural firm, I, 75
 Cabot, J. Elliot, I, 250
 Letter from: Cabot, Mrs. J. Elliot, I, 228
 Cabot, Mrs. J. Elliot,
 Letter from: Eliot, C. W., II, 121
 Letter to: Cabot, J. Elliot, I, 228
 Calendar, University, I, 241
 Calf Island, I, 321, 333, 337
 California, University of, II, 4
 Cambridge, Mass., in 1869, I, 237, 238
 Cameron, Simon, II, 212
 Capital and labor, II, 152-55, 266-70, 289
 Carey, Henry C., I, 325 *n.*
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, II, 185, 215, 291
 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, II, 185 *n.*
 Carter, Charles Shirley, I, 26
 Carter, James C., I, 256
 Carter, Tom, I, 26
 "Case system," the, I, 269; II, 63
 Cathedrals, Eliot's view of, I, 134, 156
 Catholicism, French, I, 123-26, 131; Roman, 141
 Champlain Society, I, 343
 Channing, William E., I, 216; II, 104
 Chapman, John Jay, quotation from, II, 57; reference to, 104
 Cheever, David W., of Harvard Medical School, I, 280
 Chemistry, at Harvard College under

- Cooke, I, 104, 105; laboratory method of teaching, 161-65; classes in, transferred to College Laboratories, 295
- Chicago Medical School, I, 277 *n.*
- Child, Prof. Francis J., I, 220; his teaching in English literature, 211, 250, 257-59; an adviser of the President, 306; receives invitation from Johns Hopkins, II, 14, 15, 25
- Children's books, II, 115, 116
- Choate, Joseph H., I, 42; II, 84, 85; his opinion of Langdell, I, 256
- Choate, W. G., member of A. A. Φ., I, 42
- Civil Engineer, degree of, I, 295. *See also* Degrees
- Civil Service Reform League, II, 188, 189
- Civil War, the, I, 89-93, 139
- Clark, Sir Andrew, II, 120
- Clarke, James Freeman, I, 216; II, 300
- Clarke, Sir John, I, 331
- Classical course, the, II, 82
- Classics, the, I, 97, 98, 167-69, 185, 196, 209; Eliot's opinion of, as training for orator, II, 135-37. *See also* College-entrance requirements; Greek; Latin
- Clifford, Gov., his address at Eliot's inauguration, I, 227
- Cobb, R., member of Committee on Instruction in the College, II, 143 *n.*
- College Entrance Examination Board, I, 368
- College-entrance requirements, I, 244, 365-68
- Colleges, American, theological bias in, I, 187-89; in the sixties, 206-21; difficulty of introducing reforms in, 363-66
- Collins, Patrick A., inscription to, II, 163, 164
- Columbia College, neglect of economic science in, I, 358; embraces university idea, II, 4; table of teaching staff and university enrollment in, 343
- Committee on Instruction in Harvard College, report of, II, 143-47
- Controversy, the value of, II, 285
- Convention of 1817, centennial of, II, 231
- Cooke, Josiah P., I, 42 *n.*, 44, 45; his excursions with Eliot and Storer, 46, 53-55; quarrels with Medical Faculty, 69; his relations with Eliot, 85-87; his chemical education, 104, 105; his teaching at Harvard, 105, 210, 220; his course, Chemistry I, 246; his influence on Eliot, II, 309, 310
Letter to: Eliot, C. W., I, 86
- Copeland, Prof. C. T., II, 102
- Cornell University, I, 215 *n.*; embraces university idea, II, 4
- Corporation service, II, 273-75
- Cosmopolitan Club, Harvard, II, 141, 142
- "Course," the term, II, 74 *n.*
- Cox, Gov., II, 308
- Crandon, Dr. L. R. G., quotation from, II, 58
- Crane, Charles R., II, 218, 320 *n.*
- Cuban teachers, summer school for, II, 128-31
- Curtis, B. R., I, 325 *n.*
- Curtis, George William, I, 325 *n.*
- Cushing, Misses, dame school of, I, 16
- Cutler, Prof. E. J., I, 250, 310, 311
- Dana, James D., of Department of Philosophy and Arts at Yale, I, 221
- Dana, R. H., I, 216; II, 189; Overseer of Harvard College, I, 185
- Dancing, II, 163
- Dartmouth College, in the sixties, I, 214; history in, 356; entrance requirements of, 367; table of teaching staff, electives, and university enrollment in, in 1868-69, II, 343
- Darwin, Charles, I, 331
- Davis, Jefferson, I, 142, 143
- Davis, the Misses, of Brenner's Island, I, 340
- Decorations, II, 141, 142
- Degrees, I, 170, 171, 245, 252, 295; honorary, the conferring of, by Eliot, II, 98-100. *See also* under degrees by name
- Democracy, faith in, II, 288
- Dentistry. *See* Harvard Dental School
- Dicey, Albert V., his account of Eliot's hospitality, I, 314-16; sees Eliot in England, 331
Letters from: Eliot, C. W., II, 213, 232, 280
Letter to: Dicey, Mrs. A. V., II, 117
- Dicey, Mrs. A. V., letter of Mr. Dicey to, II, 117
- "Disciplinary studies," I, 51
- Discipline, II, 48-50
- Divinity. *See* Harvard Divinity School
- Dixwell, Epes Sargent, head master of Boston Latin School, I, 16
- Doane, Bishop, letter of Eliot to, I, 371
- Doctor of Laws, degree of, I, 245. *See also* Degrees

- Doctor of Philosophy, degree of, I, 171, 245, 252; II, 11, 61. *See also* Degrees
- Doctor of Science, degree of, I, 245, 252, 295; II, 11. *See also* Degrees
- Dogmatist, a, mental attitude of, II, 55
- Donnell, Orrin, II, 323, 329, 330
- Dudley, Gov. Joseph, I, 8
- Dunbar, Charles F., member of A. A. Φ., I, 42; appointed Professor of Political Economy, 254; becomes Dean, 301; references to, 323, 337, 338; II, 83; builds house on Mount Desert, I, 344; quoted, II, 85; Eliot's attachment to, 122; death, 122
- Dunbar, William, II, 122
- Letter from:* Eliot, C. W., II, 123
- Dunne, Finley Peter ("Mr. Dooley"), his comment on Eliot, II, 201
- Dwight, Mrs. Edmund, house of, I, 12
- Dwight, Wilder, member of A. A. Φ., I, 42
- Education, practical, demand for, I, 159; the New, articles of Eliot on, 166-71, 196, 196 *n.*, 203; necessity for adjustment of, 362; difficulty of introducing reforms in, 363-66
- Education, Graduate School of, II, 224 *n.*
- Education Societies, I, 377
- Educational institutions, French, I, 116, 117, 120-26, 128-31; of Europe and America compared, 147
- Egypt, England's conduct of affairs of, II, 120, 121
- Elective system, the kernel of, I, 169; and the class system, 186, 197; early advocates of, 221; in Eliot's inaugural address, 230; considered with reference to the teachers, 259, 260; acceptance of, 300; a means for the building-up of a University, II, 28; defended, 43-47; in 1890, 65; change in meaning of the phrase, 151 *n.*
- Eliot, Andrew, the original American Eliot, I, 4
- Eliot, Rev. Andrew, I, 6
- Eliot, Catherine, C. W. Eliot's sister, I, 131, 135; marries Francis Storer, 307
- Eliot, Charles, son of Samuel, I, 8, 12
- Eliot, Charles, son of C. W. Eliot, I, 114, 117, 343, 344; his character, II, 35, 36; advice of father to, 36-40; death, 89-92; memorial volume of C. W. Eliot to, 132, 133
- Letters from:* Eliot, C. W., I, 174; II, 37, 39, 40
- Eliot, Mrs. Charles, II, 117, 175, 316, 321, 331
- Eliot, Charles William, New England forbears of, I, 3-6; his grandfathers, 6-10; his parents, 9-12; birth, 12; his birth-mark, 12-14; his childhood, 14, 15; his schooling, 16-19; his boyhood, 16-26, 28; at Nahant, 21; his reading, 23; a Unitarian by birth-right, 34, 35; student in Harvard College, 36-38, 41-47, 49, 50; studies chemistry, 44-46; his excursions with Cooke and Storer, 46, 53-55; his argument against disciplinary studies, 51; as regards his interest in literature, 52, 53; chooses a profession, 55-66; teaches in Pitts Street school, 56, 58, 59; tutor in mathematics in Harvard College, 67-69; in the class room, 68; improves upon traditional methods of instruction, 68; acts as volunteer assistant in chemistry, 69; made assistant professor in Mathematics and Chemistry, 69; administrative work of, 69-71; becomes business man of the family, 75; builds house on Kirkland Street, Cambridge, 75; engagement and marriage, 76-79; in boat race, 79-85; relations with Cooke, 85-87; transferred to Lawrence Scientific School, 88; name mentioned in connection with Presidency of Harvard College, 88; in the Civil War, 87-93, 139; his plan to reform Scientific School, 93-98; and the Rumford Professorship, 99, 112; his chemical education, 102-07; decides to study abroad, 112-14; studies French institutions and customs in Paris, 115-31; travels in Europe, 131-35; as a letter-writer, 132-34, 148; in London, 135; studies German universities, 135-38; in Rome, 138-42; his vindictiveness toward the South, 142, 143; refuses offer of superintendency of Merrimac Mills, 143-47; accepts professorship at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 152-56; at the Institute of Technology, 161-65; collaborates with Storer on *Manual of Inorganic Chemistry*, 162-65; articles of, on the *New Education*, 166-71, 196, 196 *n.*, 203; again in Europe, 172-74; illness of his wife, 171-74, 192, 193; death of youngest child, 173, 180; member of Board of Overseers, 191; becomes President of

Harvard College, 193-204; death of wife, 195, 202; consults with Brush on inaugural address, 224, 225; his inauguration, 225-29; his inaugural address, 229-34; his personality, 234, 235; becomes inmate of President's House, 237; as he appeared in Cambridge, 238; his administrative reforms, 239-44; reforms of larger implication made by, 244-61; his intention to make Harvard a great seat of learning, 260; his reforms in professional schools, 261-90; his tribute to Holmes, 282 *n.*; his tribute to Bigelow, 287 *n.*; his summary of achievement in improvement of Medical and Law Schools, 91-93; his Annual Reports, 298-300; becomes a personage, 302; a masterful workman, 303; correspondence of, 304; visitors to, 304; his business of appraisal, 305; his advisers, 305-08; his formality, 309; was not loved, 310; attitude of students toward, 311, 312; his aloofness, 313; his domestic life, 314-16; his religious views, 317, 318, 370-72; II, 297-302; his yachting and camping, I, 319-24; opposes national university, 324-29; his self-imposed limitations as regards expression of opinions, 329; speaks on higher education of women, 330; visits England, 331, 332; always lived in proximity to women of family, 333; his engagement to Miss Hopkinson, 334-37; marriage to Miss Hopkinson, 342; his social philosophy, 346; his democracy, 346-48; authors by whom he was influenced, 349-51; his view of a Liberal Education and contribution to reform in school and college curricula, 352-63, 365-68; his views on theological education, 368-70; on the training for the ministry, 375-79; on the "mendicant element" in theological seminaries, 376-79; and Gilman, II, 5; his views about advanced instruction, 6; his work in building up Graduate School, 9-14; defects in his attitude, 15-21; his idea of academic liberty, 26; a Christmas present to, 32; in Europe and Egypt (1887), 40; his solicitude for individuals, 56-59; memorandum of "points" for address to students, 59, 60; his attitude toward higher education of women, 67; his attitude toward athletics,

67-71; and the three year question, 72-74, 127, 128, 145-47; his growth, 75; his knowledge of men, 75; was a good listener, 75, 76; his conscientious candor, 76, 77; his patience in the presence of opposition, 77-79; his limitations, 79, 80; his attitude toward teachers' salaries, 80, 81; and the Board of Overseers, 82; his twenty-fifth anniversary, 83-88; adopted by the general public, 88, 89, 92, 93; death of his son Charles, 89-92; a leader of public opinion, 93-97; his "American Contributions to Civilization," 94-96; his "John Gilley, Maine Farmer and Fisherman," 95; his "Educational Reform," 96; as a writer of inscriptions, 97-101, 163, 164, 351-56; effect of his presence, 102; as a speaker, 102-11; Postmaster Generalship has attractions for, 112; views on public questions, 118-21, 123, 124; his memorial volume to his son Charles, 132, 133; his secretaries, 133; on the training for an orator, 135-37; and Prince Henry of Prussia, 137-40; Royal Order of the Prussian Crown conferred upon, 141, 142; declines post of Ambassador in London, 142; his attitude toward denominationalism, 143; on improving instruction, 144-49; his interest in problems of capital and labor, 152-55; his "Content in Work," 153; on the evils of football, 156-58; and Roosevelt, 159; his physical vigor, 161, 162; on dancing, 163; makes journey through the Southern States, 165; his resignation from Presidency of Harvard, 168-70; the best fruits of his administration, 170, 171; appraisal of his work, 172, 173; his new house, 174; his relations with neighbors and grandchildren, 174-78; examples of his comment and conversation, 176 *n.*; his recreations in Cambridge, 178; as member of the Board of Overseers, 179-85; his connection with philanthropic foundations and reform associations, 185-90; as a popular oracle, 190-93; and the Five-Foot Book-Shelf, 193-201, 357, 358; his "The Religion of the Future," 201-05; his correspondence, 205; on his training in English, 208, 209, 238; on governmental action, 213, 214; his journey

around the world, 214-19; operated on for appendicitis, 216; declines Ambassadorship to Japan, 228, 229; declines Ambassadorship to Great Britain, 229; his eightieth birthday, 237, 238; and Charles Francis Adams, 241; his friendship with Bryce, 247; made Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy, 249; views of, on the World War, 251-53, 260-65; suggestions to Wilson on American course in the World War, 256-59; his vote in presidential elections, 271, 272; his "Working of the American Democracy," 274; his continued activity after the War, 287-91; attends meeting of Industrial Conference, 293, 294; dinner given to, at White House, 295, 296; prayer written by, 299; on his biography, 302, 303; medals awarded to, 304, 305; has shingles, 321, 322; at Northeast Harbor (1925), 322-25; his thoughts of the past, 325-27; his last summer at Northeast Harbor, 330, 331; death, 332; funeral service for, 332; list of honors conferred upon, 359; portraits of, 360; sources for his Life, 361-63; bibliography of his principal writings, 364-77

Letters from: Atkinson, W. P., I, 96; Cooke, Josiah P., I, 86; Emerton, Ephraim, II, 21; Hill, A. S., I, 201; Lee, Henry, I, 195; Lyman, Theodore, I, 181, 205

Letters to: Abbott, Edwin H., II, 48; Adams, Charles Francis, 2nd, II, 151, 163, 238; Agassiz, Alexander, II, 34; Bancroft, Mrs. H. H., II, 115; Bigelow, William Sturgis, II, 314; Bird, Mrs. Charles Sumner, II, 298; Briggs, L. B. R., II, 134, 144; Brush, George J., I, 162, 200, 248, 249; II, 297 n.; Bryce, James, II, 51, 120, 123, 248, 249, 253, 260, 262, 263, 266, 270, 272, 273, 276, 279 (three), 280, 281, 282, 284, 286; Bryce, Lady, II, 303, 306, 329; Butler, Nicholas Murray, II, 56, 57, 219, 293; Cabot, Mrs. J. Elliot, II, 121; Dicey, A. V., II, 213, 232, 280; Doane, Bishop, I, 371; Dunbar, William, II, 123; Eliot, Charles, I, 174; II, 37, 39, 40; Ruth, II, 114, 129; Eliot, Samuel Atkins (father), I, 38; Eliot, Samuel Atkins (son), I, 174; II, 41 (two), 42 (two); Eliot, Mrs. Samuel Atkins (mother), I, 60, 121, 123, 128,

136, 139, 155, 156, 157, 176, 177; Endicott, William C., II, 35; Forbes, W. Cameron, II, 210; Gilman, Daniel Coit, II, 13, 14, 29, 91, 117, 131; Gordon, George A., II, 90; granddaughters, II, 206; Greene, Jerome D., II, 230, 242 (two), 294, 302, 305, 328; Hale, Edward Everett, II, 170; Hall, Edwin H., II, 127; Higginson, Henry L., II, 160, 161; Hill, Thomas, I, 99; Hoar, George Frisbie, II, 135; Hopkinson, Grace, I, 337, 339; Hopkinson, Miss Leslie, II, 227; James, William, II, 86; James, Mrs. William, II, 122; Jesse, Richard Henry, II, 230; Johnson, S. W., I, 200; Lee, Henry, II, 33; Lyman, Arthur T., I, 78, 108, 145, 201, 370 n.; II, 12, 225, 235; Lyman, Mrs. Arthur T., II, 327 (three); Lyman, Theodore, I, 78, 91, 182, 334, 335; Norton, Charles E., I, 87, 328; II, 86; Parrish, Samuel L., II, 118; Peabody, Anna, I, 149; Peabody, Ellen Derby, I, 77, 80, 81, 84; Peabody, Francis G., II, 223; Pritchett, Henry S., II, 149, 291, 317; Reisner, Christian F., II, 296; Rhodes, James Ford, II, 172, 237; Rogers, William B., I, 152; Roosevelt, Theodore, II, 156; Stickney, Albert, II, 44, 45 (two); Storey, Moorfield, II, 289; Storrow, James J., II, 163; Taft, William H., II, 125; Tebbets, Theodore, I, 43, 46, 47, 56, 57, 58, 71; Thwing, Charles F., II, 126; Towne, Edward C., II, 87; Wigglesworth, George, II, 165; Wilson, Woodrow, II, 228, 257, 258; Wister, Owen, II, 244; —, I, 285; II, 26, 31 (two), 52, 54, 142, 166, 168, 207, 208, 211, 212, 297, 299

Eliot, Mrs. Charles William (Ellen Derby Peabody), first wife of Eliot, I, 171-73, 192, 193, 202; II, 325; abroad, I, 177-79; unqualifiable, 182; 192; death, 195; Eliot's remembrance of, 331, 336

Eliot, Mrs. Charles William (Grace Hopkinson), second wife of Eliot, her appearance, I, 342; mentioned, II, 162, 178, 214, 216, 242, 244, 248, 294, 313; last illness of, 292, 315; death, 316

Eliot, Charles W., 2nd, grandson of Eliot, II, 305

Eliot, Francis, I, 321

Eliot, Grace, II, 316

- Eliot, Ruth, letters of Eliot to, II, 114, 129. *See also* Pierce, Ruth Eliot
- Eliot, Samuel, grandfather of Charles William, I, 6-9
- Eliot, Samuel Atkins, father of Charles William, I, 10; buys land at Nahant, 20; at church, 23; his hospitality, 25; Mayor of Boston, 27; his public services and other activities, 27-29; his views on theology, 29, 30; improvements of, 31 *n.*; his statement of reasons for entering the ministry, 59; business failure of, 73, 74; in adversity, 76; death, 89; his European study, 106
Letter from: Eliot, C. W., I, 38
- Eliot, Mrs. Samuel Atkins (Mary Lyman), mother of Charles William, her character, I, 13, 24; in adversity, 75; death, 333
Letters from: Eliot, C. W., I, 60, 121, 123, 128, 136, 139, 155, 156, 157, 176, 177
- Eliot, Dr. Samuel A., son of C. W. Eliot, I, 317, 344; II, 41, 331; his favorite hymns, I, 317, 319; his cottage at Northeast Harbor, II, 175
Letters from: Eliot, E. W., I, 174; II, 41 (two), 42 (two)
- Eliot, William Havard, I, 12, 28
- Eliot household, I, 22-30
- Ellis, Calvin, of Harvard Medical School, I, 280; II, 85
- Ely, Robert E., II, 305
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, I, 200, 216, 250; II, 104, 311; Eliot's opinion of, I, 43, 44; at the inauguration of Eliot, 228, 231; quoted on education, 346; quoted on society, 347; his influence on Eliot, 349; Eliot's reading of, II, 198 *n.*
- Endicott, William C., letter of Eliot to, II, 35
- England, her conduct of Egyptian and African affairs, II, 120, 121
- English colonial policy, II, 119
- English language and literature, in Harvard in the sixties, I, 211; in school and college, 354, 355, 360
- Entrance requirements, for professional schools, I, 265, 266, 291. *See also* College-entrance requirements
- Equality, the American idea of, II, 283, 284
- Eustis, Prof. Henry L., I, 94
- Evacuation Monument, Boston, Mass., inscription on, II, 101, 355
- Everett, Charles Carroll, Professor of Theology, I, 255
- Everett, Edward, President of Harvard College, I, 29, 191, 216
- Faculty lists in American colleges, I, 213, 214
- Faneuil Hall, labor meeting in, II, 154, 155
- Farlow, W. G., Instructor and then Assistant Professor, I, 255
- Felton, Cornelius C., President of Harvard College, I, 188, 248 *n.*
- Fenn, Dr. W. W., I, 369
- Fessenden, Judge Franklin G., II, 321
- Finley, Dr. John, II, 305
- Fisher, G. P., I, 250
- Fiske, John, I, 231, 250; editorial of, in *New York Nation*, 187 *n.*; Instructor in History, 255, 256
Letter to: Fiske, Mrs. John, I, 228
- Fiske, Mrs. John, letter of Fiske to, I, 228
- Fitz, R. H., I, 255
- Five-Foot Book-Shelf, the, II, 193-201; contents of, 357, 358
- Flexner, Dr. Abraham, II, 11, 19
- Florence, I, 149, 150
- Football, the evils of, II, 156-58
- Foote, Rev. Henry, I, 321
- Foote, Mary, I, 321
- Forbes, W. Cameron, letter of Eliot to, II, 210
- Franklin, Benjamin, quotation from, II, 120
- Freedom of the seas, II, 263-65
- French, in school and college, I, 355, 356, 360
- French educational institutions, I, 116, 117, 120-26, 128-31
- Fugitive Slave Law, I, 27
- Furness, H. H., member of A. A. Φ., I, 42
- Galton, Francis, I, 332
- Galveston experiment, the, II, 93 *n.*
- Garrison, William L., saved from mob, I, 27
- General Education Board, II, 185
- Geological excursions, I, 46, 53-55
- German, in school and college, I, 355, 356, 360
- German universities, I, 135
- Germanic Museum, Harvard, II, 137
- Ghent, Centennial of Treaty of, II, 231
- Gibbs, Wolcott, I, 210, 220; II, 13 *n.*; and the Rumford Professorship, I, 102-12; Eliot's treatment of, 296, 297;

- receives invitation from Johns Hopkins, II, 14, 25
- Gilley, John, II, 95
- Gilman, Pres. Daniel Coit, I, 208, 224, 225; Lounsbury quoted by, 56 *n.*; tribute of Eliot to, II, 5; his achievement at Johns Hopkins, 5, 7-9, 13, 132; and Eliot, 13-18; his retirement, 131, 132
- Letters from:* Eliot, C. W., II, 13, 14, 29, 91, 117, 131
- Godkin, E. L., I, 172 *n.*, 325 *n.*
- Gold medals, on cherishing, II, 305, 306
- Goodale, George L., Instructor and then Assistant Professor, I, 255
- Goodnow, Frank P., goes to China as technical adviser on Constitutional and Administrative Law, II, 219
- Goodwin, W. H., I, 220
- Gordon, Dr. George A., letter of Eliot to, II, 90
- Gould, Benjamin A., I, 216
- Graduate Department, becomes Graduate School, II, 65. *See also* Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
- Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard, I, 245, 248 *n.*; II, 3-5, 9-28; in 1890, 61; tables of enrollment and degrees in, 344, 345
- Graduation, age of, II, 71-75
- Grandgent, C. H., member of Committee on Instruction in the College, II, 143 *n.*
- Grant, Sir Alexander, I, 332
- Gray, Asa, I, 152, 155, 210, 218, 220, 306; II, 13, 311
- Gray, John Chipman, I, 255; quoted on Harvard Divinity School, 376
- Gray, William, of Board of Overseers of Harvard College, I, 198
- Greek, I, 353; as requirement for entrance to college, 367. *See also* Classics
- Greene, Jerome D., I, 199, II, 313; Secretary to the President and Secretary of the Corporation, 133, 134; accepts medal for Eliot, 305
- Letters from:* Eliot, C. W., II, 230, 242 (two), 294, 302, 305, 328
- Greve, C. T., II, 307
- Guild, Mrs. Benjamin, house of, I, 12
- Guild, Mrs. C. E., quoted, I, 25
- Guild, E. C., student in Harvard College, I, 36, 42 *n.*
- Gurney, Ephraim W., I, 152, 153, 155; II, 85; and the Presidency of Harvard College, I, 187, 198; the first Dean of Harvard College, 241; promoted to permanent professorship, 254; resigns Deanship, 301; a valued adviser of the President, 305, 306; death, II, 34
- Hadley, Arthur Twining, his appraisal of Eliot's work, II, 172
- Hagen, Hermann A., Professor of Entomology, I, 255
- Hague Conventions, violation of, II, 255, 256
- Hale, Edward Everett, his mottoes, I, 14, 317; II, 301, 309
- Letter from:* Eliot, C. W., II, 170
- Hall, Edwin H., letter of Eliot to, II, 127
- Hapgood, Norman, of the Collier publishing house, II, 193
- Hardie, Robert Gordon, his portrait of Eliot, II, 360
- Harnack, Adolf, quoted, I, 34
- Harper, Pres. William R., of Chicago University, I, 329 *n.*
- Harrington, Dr. T. F., quoted, I, 276
- Harvard Classics. *See* Five-Foot Book-Shelf
- Harvard College (Harvard University), its affairs of interest to Eliot family, I, 28, 29; the Class of 1853, 36; the curriculum in 1849, 36-38; the undergraduates, 41-43; Commencement in 1853, 50; exercises, 51; "parietal board," 67, 72, 73; "visitors," 68; students to be graded by written examinations, 68; Appleton Chapel, 70; processes of the Faculty, 72; color of, 79; boat race of 1858, 79-85; Boylston Hall, 86, 88, 105; the Rumford Professorship, 99-112; functions of Corporation and Overseers, 184, 232, 233; questions connected with selection of President of, 185-92; class system at, 186; Presidency of, 188-92; departments of, 189, 191 *n.*; the appointment of a President to (Eliot), 192-202; in the sixties, 206-21; functions of Faculty, 232; functions of President, 233; physical appearance of, in 1869, 236, 237; administrative reforms in, made by Eliot, 240-44; the Dean, 241; reforms of larger implication instituted at, 244-61; graduate degrees, 245, 252; honors at graduation, 245; courses of study in, 245-47; the Academic Council, 248 *n.*, 252; II, 66; University Lectures, I, 247-52;

- Thayer Hall, 252; salaries, 252; new professorships, 253, 254; appointments, 254, 255; enlargement of staff, 257; new fields for teachers in, 259; reforms in professional schools, 261-90; Annual Reports, 298-300; entrance requirements, 367, 368; Board of Preachers, 374, 381; morning prayers, 380-82; increase of salary of President, II, 34; in 1890, 63-67; Faculty of Arts and Sciences, 65, 66; creation of Administrative Committees, 66; creation of office of Dean in Scientific School and Graduate School, 66; Harvard Annex (Radcliffe College), 67; Board of Overseers, 82; endowment for the College Chapel, 165; curriculum in, in autumn term of 1868-69, 335-41; tabular view of Exercises during First Term of 1868-69, 342; table of teaching staff, electives, and university enrollment in, in 1868-69, 343; tabular comparison of growth of, 346-50. *See also* Schools by name
- Harvard College Library, the borrowing of books from, I, 241
- Harvard Dental School, I, 278, 281
- Harvard Divinity School, I, 270-73, 369-74, 379, 380
- Harvard Law School, in 1869, I, 266-68; Langdell appointed Dean of, 268; reforms in, 269, 270, 300, 301; the case system in, 269; establishment of entrance requirements for, 291; in 1890, II, 61-63; lengthening of course in, 71
- Harvard Medical School, I, 69, 273-90; method of examination in, 275; apprentice system in, 277; opposition to reforms in, 278-80; reforms in, 280-89; plea for endowment of, 289, 290; establishment of entrance requirement for, 291; in 1883, II, 63; lengthening of course in, 71; the Dean of, 160, 161
- Harvard School of Mining, I, 293-95
- Harvard School of Veterinary Medicine, II, 66
- Harvard University. *See* Harvard College
- Hazlitt, William, quoted, II, 162
- Hedge, Frederick H., Professor at Harvard, I, 222, 228, 250; quoted, 215 n.
- Henry, Joseph, II, 311
- Henry of Prussia, Prince, visits America, II, 137-40
- Higginson, Henry L., I, 42
- Letters from:* Eliot, C. W., II, 160, 161
- Higginson, Thomas Wentworth, I, 216
- Hill, A. S., I, 88, 113; II, 138; student in Harvard College, I, 36, 41, 42; made assistant professor, 254, 256
- Letter to:* Eliot, C. W., I, 201
- Hill, Thomas, President of Harvard College, I, 99, 108-10; resignation of, 184, 196 n.; opposition to his selection as President, 188, 189, 196; report of, 207; at Eliot's inauguration, 226; and University Lectures, 247, 248 n.; withdraws to parish in Maine, 307; offended at remark of Eliot, 307
- Letter from:* Eliot, C. W., I, 99
- History, in school and college, I, 356, 357, 360
- Hoar, Judge Ebenezer R., I, 109
- Hoar, George Frisbie, letter of Eliot to, II, 135
- Holleben, Theodore von, honorary degree conferred upon, II, 98
- Holmes, O. W., I, 216, 303; II, 311; anecdote of, I, 276; of Harvard Medical School, 278-82; his demonstration of the contagiousness of puerperal fever, 282 n.; hymn of, 319
- Letter to:* Motley, John Lothrop, I, 283
- Holmes, O. W., Jr., Instructor, I, 255, 268
- Hooper, Edward W., Treasurer of Harvard College (1878), I, 301
- Hopkinson, Charles S., II, 80 n., 321; his portrait of Eliot, 360
- Hopkinson, Corinna Prentiss, I, 334
- Hopkinson, Grace, engaged to Eliot, I, 334-37; married to Eliot, 342
- Letters from:* Eliot, C. W., I, 337, 339
- See also,* Eliot, Mrs. Charles William
- Hopkinson, Leslie, letter of Eliot to, II, 227
- Hopkinson, Thomas, I, 334
- Horsford, Prof. Eben, I, 88, 98, 111
- Howells, Prof. W. D., I, 250
- Hughes, Charles E., presidential candidate, II, 266, 267
- Humanities, the. *See* Classics
- Huntington, Prof. F. D., I, 83; conversion of, 86
- Hurlbut, B. S., II, 186 n.; member of Committee on Instruction in the College, 143 n.
- Hutton, Richard Holt, I, 332

- Hyde, Pres. William Dewitt, quoted, II, 28
- Immigration, restriction of, II, 52-54
- Industrial Conference (1919), II, 293
- Industrial warfare, remedies for, II, 226
- Initiative, the, II, 239
- Inscriptions, Eliot as writer of, II, 97-101, 163, 164, 351-56
- Institute for Government Research, II, 185
- International Health Board, II, 185
- Italy, I, 149-51
- Jackson, Charles L., I, 103; II, 13 *n.*, 19, 20; made assistant professor, I, 254
- James, William, I, 209; on Eliot's chemical equipment, 107 *n.*; appointed Instructor, 255, 256; letter of, describing graduating exercises of Class of '67, 275; receives invitation from Johns Hopkins, II, 14, 25
Letter from: Eliot, C. W., II, 86
Letter to: James, Mrs. William, II, 25
- James, Mrs. William, letter of Mr. James to, II, 25; letter of Eliot to, 122
- Jefferson, Thomas, advocate of elective system, I, 221
- Jesse, Pres. Richard Henry, letter of Eliot to, II, 230
- Johns Hopkins, influence of, II, 3-5, 132; founded as graduate university, 7-9, 13; competition of, with Harvard, 14; encouragement of research at, 15-22; tables of enrollment and degrees at, 344, 345
- Johnson, S. W., letter of Eliot to, I, 200
- Jowett, Benjamin, I, 331
- Jusserand, Jean Jules, honorary degree conferred upon, II, 99
- Kaltenborn, H. V., president of Cosmopolitan Club, II, 141, 142
- Kandy, II, 216
- Kidder, H. P., II, 32
- Kolbe, Hermann, chemist, I, 135, 146
- Labor and capital, II, 152-55, 266-70
- Laboratory methods, the teaching of, I, 160-65
- Land-grant colleges, I, 159
- Lane, Prof. George M., I, 209, 220; promoted to permanent professorship, 254; receives invitation from Johns Hopkins, II, 14, 25
- Langdell, Christopher C., I, 42, 43; appointed Professor in Law School, 255, 256; made Dean of Law School, 268; changes in Law School made by, II, 61, 62; references to, 83, 85
- Latin, I, 353; as requirement for entrance to college, 367. *See also* Classics
- Law. *See* Harvard Law School
- Lawrence, Bishop William, I, 308
- Lawrence Scientific School, I, 89, 167; Chemical Department of, 88; plan to reform, 93-98; the Rumford Professorship, 99-112; aims of, 160; the teaching in, 210, 211; reorganization of, 293-98; merger of, with Massachusetts Institute of Technology attempted unsuccessfully, 294; virtual absorption of, in College, II, 63, 64
- Lawrence strike, the, II, 225
- Lea, Henry C., I, 325 *n.*
- League of Nations, II, 252, 289
- Lee, Col. Henry, II, 32
Letter from: Eliot, C. W., II, 33
Letter to: Eliot, C. W., I, 195
- Lee, Robert E., I, 26
- Leland Stanford, II, 4
- "Lend-a-Hand" clubs, I, 14 *n.*
- Liberal Education, Eliot's view of, I, 352-63
- Library. *See* Harvard College Library
- Lincoln, Abraham, assassination of, I, 138-41; his oratory, II, 137; his appointments, 211-13
- Lodge, Henry Cabot, honorary degree conferred upon, II, 99
- Lodge, J. E., father of Senator Lodge, closes off point at Nahant, I, 20
- London, I, 135
- Longfellow, H. W., Professor in Harvard College, I, 37, 212, 213, 218; at Eliot's inauguration, 226
- Lovering, Joseph, advises Eliot to accept Technology offer, I, 155
- Low, Mr. and Mrs., of Brenner's Island, I, 340, 341
- Lowell, A. Lawrence, II, 307; member of Committee on Instruction in the College, 143 *n.*; elected President of Harvard University, II, 170; his policies, 179-85
- Lowell, Charles Russell, member of A. A. Φ , I, 42
- Lowell, James Russell, I, 187 *n.*, 303; II, 310; Eliot offered commission as cavalry officer through, I, 90, 91; Professor in Harvard College, 212, 216,

- 218, 220, 250; at Eliot's inauguration, 226
- Lowell, John A., remark to Eliot on Presidency, I, 8, 111 *n.*; advises Eliot to accept Technology offer, 152, 153, 155
- Lubbock, Sir John, I, 332
- Lycée Napoléon, the, I, 121-23
- Lyman, Arthur T., cousin of Eliot, I, 16, 42; II, 32; student in Harvard College, I, 36; advises Eliot to accept Technology offer, 155
Letters from: Eliot, C. W., I, 78, 108, 145, 201, 370 *n.*; II, 12, 225, 235
- Lyman, Mrs. Arthur T., II, 178
Letters from: Eliot, C. W., II, 327 (three)
- Lyman, Charles, uncle of Eliot, I, 26
- Lyman, Isaac, father of Theodore, I, 9
- Lyman, Mary, daughter of Theodore Lyman, I, 9, 10; becomes wife of Samuel Atkins Eliot, 11. *See also* Eliot, Mrs. Samuel Atkins
- Lyman, Sarah, cousin of Eliot, I, 16
- Lyman, Theodore, grandfather of Eliot, I, 9, 10
- Lyman, Theodore, uncle of Eliot, I, 26
- Lyman, Theodore, cousin of Eliot, I, 49, 76, 208; II, 32; advises Eliot to study abroad, I, 113; advises Eliot to accept Presidency of Harvard, 193, 194; his statement as regards vote of Overseers on Eliot's appointment, 198, 199; his Diary quoted on Eliot's inauguration, 226-28; an adviser of the President, 306
Letters from: Eliot, C. W., I, 78, 91, 182, 334, 335
Letters to: Eliot, C. W., I, 181, 205
- Lyman, Theodore, Jr., II, 322
- McCall, Samuel S., II, 250
- McKinley, Pres. William, II, 118, 119
- MacVeagh, Charlton, II, 307
- "Manual of Chemistry," Eliot and Storer, I, 162-65
- "Manual of Quantitative Analysis," Eliot and Storer, I, 165 *n.*
- Marburg, University of, I, 35-37
- Marsh, O. C., I, 221
- Marshall, Elizabeth, becomes wife of Andrew Eliot, I, 7
- Martin, Newell, biologist, II, 13 *n.*
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology, foundation of, I, 152; its aim and its method, 160; teaching of laboratory methods at, 161, 162; petty regulations about students abolished in, 244; merger of, with Lawrence Scientific School attempted unsuccessfully, 294
- Master of Arts, degree of, I, 245, 252; II, 11. *See also* Degrees
- Mathematics, I, 353, 360
- Medicine. *See* Harvard Medical School
- "Mendicant element," in theological seminaries, I, 376-79
- Mental Hygiene, National Committee for, II, 187
- Merrimac Mills, I, 143-47
- Metropolitan Park System of Boston, II, 90
- Michigan, University of, I, 215 *n.*; embraces university idea, II, 4
- Milan Cathedral, I, 150
- Mill, John Stuart, I, 327
- Mills, Anna, I, 119
- Mills, Charles James, death, I, 141
- Mills, Mrs. Charles, quoted, I, 14
- Mining. *See* Harvard School of Mining
- Mining Engineer, degree of, I, 295. *See also* Degrees
- Ministry, the training for, I, 374-79
- Mitten Management Corporation, its experiment with the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company, II, 270
- Modern languages and literatures, in Harvard in the sixties, I, 211-13. *See also* French; German
- Morgan, M. H., member of Committee on Instruction in the College, II, 143 *n.*
- Morrill Act, I, 159
- Morrow, Dr. Prince A., II, 187
- Motley, John Lothrop, I, 216
Letter from: Holmes, O. W., I, 283
- Mount Desert, I, 323, 343; II, 175, 177, 321, 329; Eliot builds house on, I, 344; a last visit to, 322-25; Eliot's last summer at, 330, 331
- Müller, Max, I, 331, 332
- Munro, Prof. W. B., reference to, II, 93 *n.*
- Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, I, 293
- Nahant, I, 20-22; Union Church at, 28
- National Council of Education, I, 329 *n.*
- National Education Association, I, 324
- National university, the project of, I, 324-29
- National Vigilance Association, II, 187
- Natural science, in college, I, 358-60
- Negro question, II, 166-68
- Neilson, Pres. W. A., I, 223; assists in

- making Five-Foot Book-Shelf, II, 193-95
- New England renaissance, I, 31-34
- New York Civic Forum, awards medal to Eliot, II, 304, 305
- Newell, Prof. L. C., I, 103 *n.*
- Nichols, Prof. W. R., I, 164
- Northeast Harbor. *See* Mount Desert
- Norton, Andrews, Professor of Sacred Literature in Harvard College, I, 29
- Norton, Mrs. Andrews, I, 75
- Norton, Prof. A. O., I, 215 *n.*
- Norton, Charles E., I, 120, 216; II, 79; appointed Lecturer, I, 255, 256; opposes project of national university, 328
Letters from: Eliot, C. W., I, 87, 328; II, 86
- Olmsted, F. L., quoted, I, 33
- "Open door," the, II, 261
- Orator, the training for an, II, 135-37
- Page, William, his portrait of Eliot, II, 360
- Paine, John K., Instructor and then Assistant Professor, I, 255
- Paine, R. T., Jr., II, 32
- Palfrey, John G., I, 26, 216
- Palmer, George H., II, 20; Instructor and then Assistant Professor, I, 255
- Paris Exposition, I, 172, 173, 183
- Parker, F. E., Overseer of Harvard College, I, 185; letter of, II, 82
- Parkman, Francis, I, 198, 199, 216; Fellow of Harvard College (1878), 301
- Parkman, Mary, I, 117
- Parrish, Samuel L., letter of Eliot to, II, 118
- Parsons, Theophilus, I, 43, 266
- Pasteur, Louis, II, 300, 301, 313
- Patten, William, of the Collier publishing house, II, 193, 194, 197
- Pau, I, 177
- Paul, Dr., II, 216 *n.*
- Pauncefote, Julian, honorary degree conferred upon, II, 98
- Peabody, Andrew P., I, 187, 197, 224, 226; quoted, 73; resignation as Preacher to the College and Professor, 373
- Peabody, Anna, sister of Eliot's wife, I, 131, 135, 179, 316 *n.*; marriage to Rev. Dr. H. W. Bellows, 334
Letter from: Eliot, C. W., I, 149
- Peabody, Ellen Derby, becomes wife of Eliot, I, 76-79.
Letters from: Eliot, C. W., I, 77, 80, 81, 84
See also Eliot, Mrs. Charles W.
- Peabody, Rev. Ephraim, I, 76
- Peabody, Mrs. Ephraim, I, 77, 78
- Peabody, Dr. Francis G., referred to, I, 13 *n.*, 308, 323, 339, 342; II, 307, 316; proposes organization of Board of Preachers, I, 381
Letter from: Eliot, C. W., II, 223
- Peabody, Robert, I, 337-39
- Pearce, Edward, I, 42 *n.*, 144, 191
- Peirce, Benjamin, I, 216, 220; II, 13, 311; supports Wolcott Gibbs for Rumford Professorship, I, 102, 107, 111, 112
- Peirce, C. S., I, 250
- Peirce, James Mill, I, 220; II, 26, 85; student in Harvard College, I, 36; reforms inaugurated by, 68, 69; at boat race, 83; his view of business life, 144; promoted to permanent professorship, 254
- Pennsylvania, University of, table of teaching staff, electives, and university enrollment in, in 1868-69, II, 343
- Pensions. *See* Retiring allowances
- Perry, R. B., quoted on Eliot, I, 346; reference to, II, 75
- Philippine question, the, II, 118-20
- Phillips, Wendell, speaks on higher education of women, I, 330; II, 105
- Phillips Exeter Academy, Centennial exercises at, II, 106
- Pickering, Col. Timothy, I, 9
- Pier, A. S., quotation from, II, 81 *n.*
- Pierce, Roger, II, 216
- Pierce, Ruth Eliot, II, 178, 214, 216, 328.
See also Eliot, Ruth
- Political economy, in college, I, 357, 358
- Politicians and the labor vote, II, 266-70
- Pope, Arthur, his portrait of Eliot, II, 360
- Porter, John A., I, 221
- Post-graduate work, in the sixties, I, 219, 220; advocates of the opportunity for, 221, 224. *See also* Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
- Post Office, Washington, D.C., inscriptions on, II, 356
- Potter, Louis, his portrait of Eliot, II, 360
- Pound, Dean Roscoe, I, 257

- "Practical education," I, 187, 196
 Preparatory school, studies of, I, 168, 169
 Prescott, William H., I, 216
 Presidential campaign of 1912, II, 227
 Presidential elections, II, 271
 Princeton, history in, I, 356; table of teaching staff, electives, and university enrollment in, 343
 "Prison Discipline Society, The," I, 28
 Pritchett, Dr. Henry S., II, 11.
 Letters from: Eliot, C. W., II, 149, 291, 317
 Professional schools, standards of, in 1869, I, 261-66, 290; summary of achievement in improvement of, to 1878, 291-93; age of graduation from, II, 71-74. *See also* Schools by name
 Professions, the, in America in 1869, I, 261
 Professors, causes for demand of resignation of, II, 31, 32
 Profit-sharing schemes, II, 232, 233, 235-37, 269
 Prohibition, Eliot's views on, II, 317-20
 Public Reservations, Board of Trustees of, establishment of, II, 90
 Puerperal fever, I, 282 *n.*
 Puritanism, I, 31, 32
 Putnam, Prof. F. W., II, 20
 Putnam, Rev. George, I, 79, 193, 307

 Quincy, Josiah, President of Harvard College, I, 29, 188

 Radcliffe College, II, 67
 Raphael, his Sistine Madonna, I, 151
 Rawle, Francis, II, 244 *n.*
 Recall, the, II, 239
 Referendum, the, II, 239
 Reisner, Dr. Christian F., letter of Eliot to, II, 296
 "Religion of the Future, the," II, 201-05
 Remsen, Ira, chemist, II, 13 *n.*
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, N.Y., I, 161 *n.*
 Reports, departmental, I, 241
 "Research," II, 4, 19-24
 Retiring allowances, II, 81 *n.*
 Rhine, the, I, 134
 Rhodes, James Ford, letters of Eliot to, II, 172, 237
 Rhodes, Mrs. James Ford, letter of Mrs. Toy to, II, 141

 Richards, Theodore, II, 81
 Richardson, Dr. William L., II, 83
 Robinson, John, II, 42
 Rockefeller Foundation, II, 185
 Rogers, William B., President of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, I, 96 *n.*, 152, 155, 160
 Letter from: Eliot, C. W., I, 152
 Rolleston, George, I, 331
 Rome, I, 140-42
 Roosevelt, Theodore, honorary degree conferred upon, II, 99; and Eliot, 159; his use of officeholders and ex-officeholders, 227; as presidential candidate, 227; gives dinner to Eliot at White House, II, 295, 296; Eliot's estimate of the effect of his life on the nation, 299
 Letter from: Eliot, C. W., II, 156
 Root, Elihu, II, 291, 305; honorary degree conferred upon, 99
 Ropes, John Codman, honorary degree conferred upon, II, 100
 Ross, Denman W., his portrait of Eliot, II, 360
 Rowing, with six-oared shell, I, 80
 Rowland, Henry A., physicist, II, 13 *n.*
 Royce, Josiah, II, 8
 Rugby School, I, 165 *n.*
 Rumford Professorship, I, 99-112, 296
 Runkle, Prof., I, 155, 161

 Salaries, I, 252; II, 80, 81; and fees, I, 99, 100
 Saltonstall, Leverett, I, 226
 Sanders house, Salem, II, 100, 101
 Sanford, Justice E. T., II, 307
 Sargent, C. S., made Director of Arnold Arboretum, I, 255; in England, 332
 Sargent, Mrs. C. S., I, 332
 Sargent, John Singer, his portrait of Eliot, II, 360
 "Scab," as hero, II, 155 *n.*
 Scholastic excellence, on badges of, II, 245
 Science, rewards of, I, 64, 65; in United States in 1865, 146, 147; new field for, in America, 159; Harvard Schools of Applied, 293-98
 Sciences, moral and political, the teaching of, in the sixties, I, 209; natural, the teaching of, in the sixties, 210, 211.
 See also Chemistry; Natural Science
 Schools, studies in, I, 352-61; reforms in curricula of, 363-66
 Sears, Mrs. S. F., quoted, I, 10

- Sex Hygiene, Federation for, II, 187
 Shaler, Nathaniel S., promoted to permanent professorship, I, 254
 Shaw, Mrs. Gardiner Howland, I, 76
 Shaw, Lemuel, I, 216
 Shaw, Col. Robert Gould, II, 101
 Shaw Monument, inscription on, II, 101, 354
 Sheffield Scientific School, I, 160, 210, 211, 222 *n.*; II, 4
 Silliman, the younger, I, 221
 Simon, John, I, 331
 Simplex Wire and Cable Company, II, 235
 Slavery question, I, 27
 Social Hygiene Association, American, II, 187, 188
 Sophocles, Evangelinus A., I, 220
 Spanish War, speech of Eliot during, II, 107-09
 Sparks, Jared, frequenter of Eliot household, I, 26; President of Harvard College, 29, 36, 91, 216, 222
 Spencer, Herbert, his influence on Eliot, II, 349-51
 Sprague, O. M. W., member of Committee on Instruction in the College, II, 143 *n.*
 Stearns, Prof., I, 267
 Stephen, Leslie, I, 306, 331
 Stickney, Albert, letters of Eliot to, II, 44, 45 (two)
 Stillé, C. J., I, 325 *n.*
 Storer, Francis H., I, 42 *n.*, 45; his excursions with Eliot and Cooke, 46, 53-55; his European study, 107; wishes Eliot to accept professorship at University of Technology, 153-55; at the Institute of Technology, 161; collaborates with Eliot on Manual of Inorganic Chemistry, 162-65; Professor in Bussey Institution, 256; marries Catherine Eliot, 307; appointed Professor of Agricultural Chemistry and Dean of School of Agriculture and Horticulture, 307
 Storey, Moorfield, letter of Eliot to, II, 289
 Storrow, James J., letter of Eliot to, II, 163
 Story, Joseph, I, 216
 Straits Settlements, II, 119, 120
 Sullivan, Rev. Thomas Russell, school of, I, 16, 50
 Sumner, Miss, I, 16
 Sundays in Boston, I, 21, 22
 Swiss Military System, II, 276-78, 289
 Taft, William Howard, II, 308; honorary degree conferred upon, 99
 Letter from: Eliot, C. W., II, 125
 Teacher, on the usefulness of, I, 60, 61
 Tebbets, Theodore, I, 42; on Eliot's election to Presidency of Harvard College, 195
 Letters from: Eliot, C. W., I, 43, 46, 47, 56, 57, 58, 71
 Thayer, James B., member of A. A. Φ., I, 42; appointment of, to Law School, 255, 256
 Thayer, Rev. Joseph Henry, Fellow of Harvard College (1878), I, 301
 Thayer, Nathaniel, I, 252 *n.*
 Thayer, W. R., II, 83
 Theological education, I, 368, 369, 374-80
 Three Year Degree Question, II, 73, 74, 127, 128, 145-47
 Thwing, C. F., his appraisal of Eliot's work, II, 173
 Letter from: Eliot, C. W., II, 126
 Ticknor, George, I, 29, 31, 137; studies in Europe, 106; advocates college reform, 221
 Ticknor, Mrs. George, house of, I, 12
 Tocqueville, A. C. H. C. de, II, 51
 Torrey, Miss, I, 308
 Towne, Edward C., letter of Eliot to, II, 87
 Toy, Mrs. Crawford H., letter to Mrs. James Ford Rhodes, II, 141
 Trades Unionism, II, 207, 239, 240
 Trinity College, entrance requirements of, I, 367
 Trowbridge, John, awarded the first S. D. in Physics at Harvard, I, 245; made assistant professor, 254; receives invitation from Johns Hopkins, II, 14, 25
 Truth, the value of, I, 62; the pleasure of the pursuit of, 63
 Tucker, President William J., I, 214
 Tufts, Mr. and Mrs., of Brenner's Island, I, 340
 Tufts College, entrance requirements of, I, 367
 Unitarian Churches, General Conference of, II, 187
 Unitarianism, I, 32-34; abroad, 127; and Harvard Divinity School, 370,

- 372, 373; and the thinking classes, II, 242
- Universities, American, period of adolescence of, II, 3; growth of, 224
- University, the need of a, I, 205; advocates of the idea of, 221-24; functions of, II, 87, 88
- "University idea, the," II, 3
- University Lectures, I, 247-52; II, 11
- University of Paris, I, 137
- University president, the work of a, II, 31
- University Statutes, I, 241
- Ursuline Convent, burning of, I, 26
- Vacations, I, 241
- Van Dyke, Rev. Henry, II, 305
- Veterinary Medicine. *See* Harvard School of Veterinary Medicine
- Volstead Act, II, 317-19
- Walcott, Dr. Henry P., I, 14, 198, 309; II, 136, 178; conversation reported by, 112; his account of last visit to Northeast Harbor, 322-25
- Walker, James, President of Harvard College, I, 67, 70, 71, 112, 190, 191; remark of Eliot on, I, 3; advises Eliot to accept Presidency of Harvard, 192; at Eliot's inauguration, 226; a valued adviser of Eliot, 306
- Warren, Prof. Minton, II, 117, 118
- Warren, Mrs. Minton, incident regarding the President related by, I, 313 *n.*
- Washburn, Gov., II, 136
- Washburn, Prof. Emory, I, 268
- Washington, George, II, 104
- Wayland, Francis, President of Brown, I, 191, 221
- Welch, Dr. W. H., I, 277 *n.*
- Wendell, Prof. Barrett, II, 69, 78; his "A Literary History of America," 134, 135
- Wesleyan College, entrance requirements of, I, 367
- White, Andrew D., I, 208; quoted, 223 *n.*; his views on endowed education, 327
- White, James C., his Diary quoted, I, 37; of Harvard Medical School, 280, 282
- Whitney, Rev. Mr., I, 50
- Whitney, C. L. B., awarded the first Ph.D. in History at Harvard, I, 245
- Whitney, J. D., Professor at Harvard, I, 210, 220, 250
- Letter from:* Brush, George J., I, 111
- Whitney, W. D., Professor at Yale, I, 212, 221, 225, 249
- Wigglesworth, George, II, 307
- Letter from:* Eliot, II, 165
- Williams, George, I, 9
- Williams, Lydia, becomes wife of Theodore Lyman, I, 9
- Williams College, entrance requirements of, I, 367; table of teaching staff and university enrollment in, in 1868-69, II, 343
- Wilson, Woodrow, election of, II, 228; his refusal to intervene with arms in Mexico, 249; candidate for reelection, 266, 267
- Letters from:* Eliot, C. W., II, 228, 257, 258
- Winsor, Justin, I, 216, 217; student at Harvard College, 36
- Winthrop, Robert C., I, 187, 216
- Women, higher education of, I, 330; II, 67. *See also* Radcliffe College
- Woodworth, J. B., member of Committee on Instruction in the College, II, 143 *n.*
- Woolsey, Theodore D., I, 325 *n.*
- World War, the, II, 247, 255-65; the causes of, 251-54; ratification of peace treaty, 281
- World's Fair of 1893, Water Gate, inscriptions on, II, 100, 351-53
- Written examinations, I, 68, 69
- Wyman, Jeffries, I, 210, 216, 220; II, 13, 311; advises Eliot to accept Technology offer, I, 152, 153, 155; a valued adviser of the President, 306
- Yale College, Department of Philosophy, I, 167, 171, 222 *n.*; French and German in, 355, 356; entrance requirements of, 367; development of, as University, II, 4; table of teaching staff, electives, and university enrollment in, in 1868-69, 343
- Yuan Shih-Kai, II, 217, 218
- Zionism, II, 289

